A

Rational Defence

OF

Non-conformity:

WHEREIN THE

Practice of NONCONFORMISTS

IS

Vindicated from Promoting *Popery*, and Ruining the CHURCH, imputed to them by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Unreasonableness of Separation.*

ALSO

His Arguments from the Principles and Way of the Reformers, and first Dissenters are Answered. And the Case of the present Separation, truly stated; and the blame of it laid where it ought to be. And the way to Union among *Protestants* is pointed at.

By *GILBERT RULE*, Minister of the Gospel.

Ezek. XLIII. 10, 11.

Thou Son of Man, shew the House to the House of Israel, *that they may be ashamed of their Iniquities, and let them measure the pattern*, &c.

And if they be ashamed of all that they have done, shew them the form of the House, and the fashion thereof, &c.

LONDON,

Printed for **John Salusbury**, at the Rising-**Sun**, near the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhil*. MDC LXXXIX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

THE fierce Contentions of this Age about the Mint, and Anniſe, and Cummin of Religion, (I mean Religious Ceremonies that men have deviſed and impoſed) hath, in a great meaſure hindered people from minding, with that application that becometh the weightier things of the Law; to wit, the love of God, and of our Neighbour, and due regard to the promoting of true holineſs, and the Salvation of mens Souls, the heavy Sufferings of many in England, and in Scotland, for not complying with ſuch things, as their impoſing Task-maſters did not ſo much as pretend to give Scripture warrant for, are too notorious to be denied, and too ſmarting to be forgotten: How many thouſands have been put on this ſad Dilemma? either to wound their Conſciences, or to be deſtroyed by taking away their Eſtates, Liberties, Livelihood, and life it ſelf. But now the Lord (in his infinite wiſdom, and tender mercy to an undeſerving generation) having by ſome late

late Revolutions, first broken the Yoak of the Oppressors, and made them, for some time taste a little of the Cup that they had made their brethren drink deeply of; and then gratiously, and wonderfully, delivered both contending parties from that utter ruine that was manifestly impending; and made us like them that Dream'd, and done exceeding abundantly for us, above what we could think, out done our faith, as was foretold, Luk. 18. 8. *He hath by this surprising providence, laid an Obligation on all* Protestants (*and they who are such in earnest, will mind it*) *to turn to the Lord from every evil way, that hath been in their heart or hand; and particularly to* keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; *to endeavour to speak, and do the same things; and where that cannot be attained, (through want of light, and other sinful disorders of the Soul, not easily, nor soon removed, without that pouring out of the Spirit from on high, promised,* Isa. 33. 15. *and elsewhere; which we should daily, and earnestly pray and wait for.) To bear with one another in Love. They who know no other way to* Unity, *but* Uniformity, *will for ever miss of their design, unless either all men were perfect in knowledge, and wholly freed from irregular passions, or Conscience were wholly laid to sleep, and its use banished out of the World.*

Toward this blessed end, peace among Protestants, *sober reasoning between Dissenting Parties, may have some usefulness; even* Eristick *Writings, may prove* Irenick, *if managed, and read, with that Spirit that becometh the gospel; that is, with due love to truth and peace; and if I did not judge this book to be of that tendency, I should never consent that it should see the light. The Apostle giveth us two excellent directions for attaining this end,* Phil. 3. 16. (*beside the duty of forbearing one another, till the Lord clear mistakes to them who are out of the way, which he doth more than insinuate,* ver. 15.) *but alas, even about these ways to peace we contend, as will appear in this Treatise:*

tiſe: Yet in my opinion, the Apoſtle doth there clearly hold forth, that there is a rule to which all are obliged to conform their actions, and principles, and particularly, Church Adminiſtrations: Let us walk by the ſame rule: *In all reaſon, this rule muſt be Divine, in that it is here generally injoyned to be minded, and that by all Chriſtians. Is it imaginable that the Apoſtle intendeth to oblige all the Churches to take a rule of mans making for directing them how they ſhall pleaſe* God? *Beſides, Church, or humane Canons never were, or are like to be the ſame in all Churches; nor indeed can they, of the things that are left to the Church to order at her diſcretion, that which is fit in one place, may be moſt unfit in another. Wherefore if the Apoſtle had aimed at theſe, he would have ſpoken of Rules, not a rule. We have then cauſe to think, that the way to Church peace is to take the Word of* God *for the rule by which all the affairs of his Houſe ſhould be ordered: If we would enjoyn nothing, peculiar to Religion, to be obſerved, but what is warranted there: And would not be too buſie in making Canons, for determining theſe things that are Extrinſick to Religion, its Rites common to it with other ſolemn actions, further than neceſſity requireth, and in theſe determinations, keep within the bounds of the general directions of the Word of* God: *If we would do all things in the Church* decently and in order; *and then make nothing ſuch by our Will and Authority; but enjoyn the Obſervation of theſe things, that Scripture hath declared to be ſuch, or nature, and civil cuſtom hath made ſuch: If we would content our ſelves with that* decency *and* order *that was in the* Apoſtolick Church: *Our Controverſie would ſoon be at an end. It is true, even where Scripture is taken for the rule, there might be ſome different apprehenſions about the meaning of this rule, what it enjoyneth; but they who ſincerely ſeek the mind of* God *in his words, and depend on him for the light of his Spirit, readily will either find what they ſeek, or will ſoberly and peaceably differ from their brethren. But when this rule is laid aſide, and*

mans wiſdom muſt injoyn what is fit in God's Worſhip, *(even though they be Learned, Wiſe, and Holy men, and in authority in the* Church, *yet not infallibly guided; and much more when any of theſe Qualities are wanting) there can hardly be an end of controverſie, it will be hard to ſet bounds to their multiplicity (of which the* Popiſh Church *is a fatal Witneſs) and hard to bring them to an end by compoſing them, unleſs blind obedience be aſſerted; at leaſt as to ſome things: And how many things theſe ſhall be, who knoweth?*

The other Direction that the Apoſtle giveth in that place, is, let us mind the ſame things: Unity in deſign is very conducive to Unity in Heart and Practice: When all have one end before them, they will the more readily fall into the ſame way leading to that end; as when many are travelling to the ſame City, *they will readily go in the ſame road; or if one take a gainer way, as he thinketh, then another, yet they will not fall out about that. Let us then all make the one thing needful, our buſineſs; let us mind ſerious and practical Religion; and in Subordination to that, let us mind the* Converſion, *and* Edification *of the Souls of the people under our charge: Let us ſet our ſelves againſt Immorality, Ignorance, (which, alas, doth abound every where) Atheiſtical and careleſs neglect of Religion: Let us labour to awaken the people to mind how they ſhall be ſaved, and put them in mind of the hazard of reſting on outſide Worſhip, whither it be with, or without the Ceremonies that we controvert about: If we all have a true Idea of that Religion, that we ſhould labour to inſtill into the minds of people, and have that impreſſion of the weight, and indiſpenſable neceſſity of it, that the Apoſtle expreſſeth,* 2 Cor. 5. 11. *knowing therefore the terrour of the* Lord, *we perſwade men: If we were one in this, it would much contribute to oneneſs in things that are more remote from the eſſence and life of Religion. But while we mind our own things (which muſt needs be very different) while one ſort is for their Grandeur, and Riches, and Dominion, and Eaſe; and another*

is for his Eaſe and Applauſe among one ſort of men: While we are for keeping up a party, for victory over them that we contend with, and for maintaining our credit, ſo as we are aſhamed to change, leaſt we fall under the imputation of being once in a miſtake: I ſay, while theſe different ends and motives are ſuffered to influence us, we muſt be far from agreement about any thing that hath been the Subject of our Debates, while Luſts war in our Members, Wars, and Fightings will be the product of them, Ja.4.1. *As this purging of our ſelves, from bad things might conduce to the* Churches *peace, ſo might a joynt endeavour on both ſides to purge the* Church *from bad Men; an Ignorant, Scandalous, Heady, and Unſober Miniſtry is a great let to peace: God will not be at peace with the* Church, *while ſuch are countenanced, and good men cannot with any ſatisfaction behold ſuch* Scandals *to* Religion, *and ſuch effectual Inſtruments of the ruine of Souls, continued in the* Church: *Such Miniſters are Make-bates in the* Church: *While ſome effectual courſe is not taken to remove them, the* Church *is like to have little peace, either with* God, *or in her ſelf. Let all then (if they would ſee* Religion *flouriſh, and the* Church *ſetled in peace) contribute their endeavours to get the unſavoury Salt (that hath long made us unpleaſing to* God) *caſt out; and to oppoſe the entrance of them into the Holy Function of the Miniſtery, who are not in ſome tollerable meaſure ſuch as the Apoſtle requireth, and are not in a probable capacity, by their life, and doctrine, and diligence, to do good to Souls; and let none countenance or plead for unfit perſons, either to be admitted into, or kept in the* Church: *Pity to mens Perſons, or Families, being horrid cruelty, when the ruine of Souls is the neceſſary conſequent of ſuch Acts: When love to the Salvation of men beareth ſway with us above zeal for a Party, we will eaſily be prevailed with in this. If this piece of Reformation be endeavoured, all Ranks muſt put hand to it, the people by diſcovering ſuch, where they are, and not calling, nor countenancing them, when they want a guide to*

their

their Souls: And Magiſtrates, by endeavouring the regulating of ſuch Laws as do in any wiſe open the door to ſuch men to enter, or protect them when they already are in places: And Miniſters in their ſtation, by rejecting ſuch Candidates *of the Miniſtry, as are not duly qualified, and cenſuring the immoralities of ſuch as have made a ſhift to get into that Office, notwithſtanding of their notorious unworthineſs.*

In order to obtaining the Peace of the Church (which we all prize and deſire) Reformation is alſo neceſſary; peace and purity will not long be ſeparated the one from the other; perſonal reformation muſt not be wanting, if it will give hope of Peace, even from Enemies, Prov. 16. 7. *much more is it the way to be bleſſed with peace from our Friends; without it there is no peace with God, nor Man, but ſuch as is a Curſe to them who have it,* 2 King. 9. 22. Iſa. 32. 17, 18. *Church Reformation muſt alſo truly be endeavoured by us, if we would have Church-peace; it is no token for good, when ſinful Evils (Images of Jealouſie, that provoke the Lord to jealouſie) are in the Church, and yet all agree in theſe ways; none lament them, none reprove them, none take care to keep their Garments clean of the Corruptions of the Time; like thoſe whom the Lord doth ſo highly commend,* Rev. 3. 3. *If we expect peace, we muſt be humbled before the Lord, for our perſonal and publick Deviations, and be ready to confeſs them before the World; we muſt take Shame, if we expect that he ſhould favour, and honour us. See* Ezek. 43, 10, 11. *While we are fixed in evil ways, and will not be convinced; or ſo proud that we are aſhamed to acknowledge that we have been out of the way: God nor Man can make no peace with us. Neither is this all, but we muſt turn from our evil ways, of whatever ſort they be particularly, while Church Grievances are continued; while no effectual courſe is taken, and that unanimouſly, and with ſerious application, to remove Scandals, to ſatisfie the Conſciences, and quiet the Minds of ſuch as are grived; how can Attempts*

for

for Peace have any ſucceſs? I ſuppoſe it will not be denyed by ſober and intelligent Men, that there are faults in the Church (tho' ſome do ſtrangely Hyperbolize in declaiming of her perfection; but they that are in that ſtrain, of whatever party they be, do little underſtand the Scripture Patern, and the Church-way that themſelves own, and do not compare the one with the other) Non-reſidences, Pluralities, want of Parochial Diſcipline, abuſe of Excommunication, making that which paſſeth for Church Diſcipline and cenſures; to be more deſtructive to mens purſes, than to their vices; and other ſuch things, are too groſly evil to be defended, and too well known to be denyed, or diſſembled. It were one good ſtep toward peace, if there might be a proſpect of getting ſuch Enormities done away; and the affairs of the Houſe of God managed in a way more like that of the Goſpel. It might alſo make for our Peace, if all of us, of both parties, ſhould put on a Spirit of meekneſs, and rather lament what we cannot approve, than reproach one another for ſuch things. An unſober, and fierce Spirit hath too much appeared on both Hands; our Zeal for and againſt the things controverted, is no way proportioned to the things themſelves. Many have not a different degree of Zeal againſt the groſſeſt parts of Popery, from what they uſe againſt ſome of the Rags of that Whors attire; tho' all be unjuſtly charged with this, yet it is too evident to be the temper and way of ſome: Its true immorality in Miniſters, and viſible Enmity againſt the practice and power of Religion, may juſtly ſtir the indignation of a ſerious Chriſtian, but to be ſo affected toward all that differ from us, in the leſſer matters of Religion, is a Zeal not kindled from Heaven: On the other Hand, the odious compariſon that is made between Popery *and* Presbytery, *preferring the former as more Eligible, which is frequent in the Mouths, not of the Rable only, but of Men of Name and Authority in the Church, doth not ſavour of that meekneſs guided by a ſound judgment, which becometh the Goſpel: Let them who are Godly and Sober on both ſides, love and eſteem one a-*

nother in the Lord; and we may hope for more peace in the Church, than yet we have ſeen. This ill temper now hinted at, ſhould be ſhunned by all, and reproved where it appeareth, by them who would promote the peace of the Goſpel.

If by all the means mentioned, or other good ways, peace cannot be obtained, we muſt not ſtep out of Gods way to obtain it; Truth muſt be bought at any rate, but Peace may be too dear to be bought by a Chriſtian: It may be impoſſible, *it may* not lie in us to live peaceably *with ſome men; yea, or with a Church,* Rom. 12.8. *Holineſs is ſimply neceſſary not Peace,* Heb. 12.14. *Wherefore it is to be expected, that we ſhould yield in the matters of God (however little they maybe comparatively) as one may and ought to do, for peace ſake, in his own matters; Men cannot command their Light & Conſciences, are unplyable things to worldly, or carnal Arguments; yea, to thoſe that ſeem to have ſomewhat in them more divine, ſeeing the leaſt Evil is not to be done, or aſſented to for attaining the greateſt good: Over-powering light to change our minds, or forbearing one another, till that light ariſe; are the true methods to compoſe Debates in the Church. Aſſent and Subſcription to what is required, while an inward diſlike of it remaineth, is a way to Peace in a Church; that the Lord doth not approve, and that will not have Stability, nor a good Iſſue.*

I have no further account to give of this book, but that it was written a few years ago, which muſt excuſe ſome paſſages that may ſeem not to ſuit our preſent caſe: It was a doing when King James *came to the* Crown; *the caſe of* Proteſtants *ſoon after made it appear unſeaſonable to contend about our private Sentiments wherein we differ, when we all were like to be undone by a* Deluge of Popery. *But now after the ſtate of the Nation hath been unhinged, and is in a hopeful way to be ſetled, it may ſeem allowable, if not neceſſary, that each Party ſhould put in their claim, and give the beſt reaſons they can for their pretenſions; and that with all moderation and peaceableneſs: And having ſo done, that they ſhould leave it to them who ought*

to

to judge, what is fitteſt to be choſen. This I have endeavoured ut potui, non ut debui, *wiſhing that ſome other perſon, by whom it might have been done to more advantage, had taken this Task: Some may readily diſlike the way of managing this debate, following the Antagoniſt* κατὰ πόδας: *but this I could not well ſhun. The* Reverend Doctor's *method not being very exact, and many things that might ſtumble an ordinary Reader, being brought in by him, where it could little be expected. This way I thought moſt uſeful for them who want inſtruction; and others, as they do not need any help that I can afford them, ſo they can ſuffer no prejudice by this manner of reaſoning. I ſubmit all that I have ſaid, to the cenſure of the judicious, candid, and unbyaſs'd* Reader, *and to the Authority of the* Church *of* Chriſt, *in any of her* Lawful Aſſemblies. *If any ſhall judge that I have yielded too much; or, that I have condeſcended too little for the ſake of unity, I am willing to be corrected, by any who ſhall bring plain Scripture, or ſolid reaſon, for what they alledge.*

12 JY 62

A

Rational Defence

OF

Non-conformity, &c.

THey who find themſelves under an Obligation from the Authority of a Holy and Jealous God, to regard the Purity of his Worſhip, and keep their Conſciences from being defiled with the Corruptions that Men have brought into that Worſhip, are at this day under moſt Severe Perſecution, and that from their Fellow-Proteſtants, (which is no ſmall aggravation of their Trouble) when the common Enemy is ready to deſtroy us, and the Religion that we do jointly profeſs: But our Brethren are not ſatisfied with our other Sufferings, but we are laſhed with their Tongues and Pens, and expoſed as the moſt contemptible and moſt unreaſonable of Men; and that not only by the Common ſort of Miniſters and People, that are of the oppoſite Party, (*whoſe Zeal againſt us carrieth them commonly to profeſs, that Papiſts are better than Presbyterians*, and that Religion rather to be choſen than this. A great Token of Reſpect to the Proteſtant Religion! as if all the Principles of it, in which we agree with them, were of leſs value than the Cermonies, owned as Indifferent things, wherein we differ from them,) but even by the Reverend and Learned

12 JY 62

A

Rational Defence

OF

Non-conformity, &c.

THey who find themſelves under an Obligation from the Authority of a Holy and Jealous God, to regard the Purity of his Worſhip, and keep their Conſciences from being defiled with the Corruptions that Men have brought into that Worſhip, are at this day under moſt Severe Perſecution, and that from their Fellow-Proteſtants, (which is no ſmall aggravation of their Trouble) when the common Enemy is ready to deſtroy us, and the Religion that we do jointly profeſs: But our Brethren are not ſatisfied with our other Sufferings, but we are laſhed with their Tongues and Pens, and expoſed as the moſt contemptible and moſt unreaſonable of Men; and that not only by the Common ſort of Miniſters and People, that are of the oppoſite Party, (*whoſe Zeal againſt us carrieth them commonly to profeſs, that Papiſts are better than Presbyterians*, and that Religion rather to be choſen than this. A great Token of Reſpect to the Proteſtant Religion! as if all the Principles of it, in which we agree with them, were of leſs value than the Cermonies, owned as Indifferent things, wherein we differ from them,) but even by the Reverend and Learned

ned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, a Man formerly Eminent for his Moderation; yet in this Book, now under examination, treateth his Antagoniſts with that Contempt and Severity that was not expected from a man of his worth. That poor ſuffering party, though they have no Shelter againſt their other Afflictions, but to make that GOD their Refuge, for Obedience to whom they ſuffer; yet may be allowed, I hope, a modeſt Apology for their way and practice, by which that Reproach that is caſt on them may be rowled away, and their Innocency vindicated. In order to this, I have made bold to attempt the Anſwering of this Book (looking for his help whoſe Cauſe we plead.)

But before I meddle with the Book it ſelf, it is needful to ſurvey his long PREFACE, conſiſting of 94 pages, wherein his main buſineſs is to faſten on the *Nonconformiſts* a moſt heavy Charge, as if they were Promoters of the Intereſt of *Popery*.

Sect. 2. If any *Diſſenters* of that Time did uſe the Excellent B. *Jewel* (whoſe Memory is ſtill precious among all Proteſtants) *ungratefully and ſpightfully for preaching his Opinion*, in Defence of the Church-Order of *England*, they deſerve Blame; it had been their part to vindicate their Principles by a ſober and rational Defence againſt the Biſhop's Arguments, but not to ſhew Diſreſpect to a perſon who had ſo well deſerved for his Learned Labours againſt *Popery*. But I do not well underſtand how this unworthy Carriage ſhould conſiſt with the Character that the Dr. doth afterwards give of theſe Diſſenters, as to their moderation and compliance with the *Church's* way, when he hath a mind to expoſe the preſent *Non-conformiſts* as far degenerate from their Anceſtors in the ſame Profeſſion. But of this more in its due place.

Sect. 3. He complaineth (*p.* 2.) of his own hard Uſage on *the like Occaſion*. His Sermon entituled, *The Miſchief of Separation*, was indeed ſolidly refuted by ſeveral *Non-conformiſts*, and in that ſence his Sermon was *hardly uſed*; but I never heard before, that *hard Arguments* were counted *hard Uſage* from an Adverſary; and if Biſhop *Jewel* had no harder Uſage for his Sermon, there was no need of this Complaint, unleſs it were to make his own hard Fate the more conſpicuous, by ſo venerable a Parallel. This Reverend Author ſhould conſider, That tho' we owe and give all due *deference* to the *Memory* of Biſhop *Jewel*, and to the *Worth* of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, for their Labours in Defence of Proteſtantiſm; yet it is neither Ingratitude nor Incivility in us to defend the purity of Goſpel-

Worſhip

Worſhip againſt their Aſſaults: We honour them, but retain our Liberty of diſſenting from them, and of owning our Diſſent, when they miſtake, and are out of the way. We call no man *Rabbi*, having one Maſter, *CHRIST*, whoſe written Word we make the Rule of our *Faith* and *Worſhip*. But one great part of the Doctor's *hard Uſage* lieth in this, *That it hath been maliciouſly ſuggeſted by ſome, and too eaſily believed by others, that he was put on that Work with a deſign to inflame our Differences, and to raiſe Perſecution.* I confeſs *Malice* to ſuggeſt *Evil*, and over-eaſineſs to believe it, is a thing too common among Diſſenting Parties; the Lord heal theſe Diſtempers on both hands; but the particular Ground of this Charge on his Antagoniſts, ſhould have been mentioned. If any have ſuſpected that he was put on the Work; if the work be good, that doth extenuate the fault of ſuch Suſpicion. I know no Evil in following either the Advice or Command of others to do our Duty: So that hitherto there is no Ground for the heavy Charge of Malice and malign Credulouſneſs. If any have judged his Deſign, that is not fair dealing, ſuch Secrets are to be left to the Judgment of him *who knoweth the Hearts*. But tho' I have a great deal of Charity in reference to the *Intentio Operantis*; yet it is not ſo eaſie to paſs a favourable Judgment on the *Intentio Operis*; but he endeavoureth afterward his Vindication in this, where I ſhall attend him.

Sect. 4. His profeſſed Deſign in preaching that Sermon, was only his juſt apprehenſion, *That the Deſtruction of the Church of* England, *under a preſence of Zeal againſt* Popery, *was one of the likelieſt Means to bring it* [Popery] *in*. Here he ſuppoſeth, (if I underſtand what he ſaith) that the Proteſtant Diſſenters *aim* at the deſtruction of the Church of *England*; or at leaſt, that Non-conformity tendeth to deſtroy it, than which no imagination can be more groundleſs; nor can I conceive what ſhould give cauſe to ſuch a thought, unleſs it be an extravagant Idea, that ſome men frame to themſelves of the Church of *England*, as if her Eſſence conſiſted in the Ceremonies, and the removing of theſe were the deſtruction of the Church: We, *who Diſſent from that* which they call the Church of *England*, are far from ſuch low and diſhonourable thoughts of Her; we look on her as a Reformed part of the Church of God, profeſſing the Proteſtant Religion, in oppoſition to the Errours of *Popery*, but mixing this True Religion with ſome humane Ceremonies; and therefore we think, that oppoſing of theſe Ceremonies is *ſo far* from tending to the Deſtruction of the Church, that it conduceth much

to reforming of Her: But ſuppoſe the Ceremonies were good and lawful things, it is ſtill a ſtrange Notion, and inconſiſtent with the Sentiments concerning them, that our Brethren do profeſs, that they are *indifferent* things, and of no neceſſity: If they *be ſo* what hazard is there of the deſtruction of the Church, from their being laid aſide? If the Non-conformiſts had their wiſh, it would inferr no other Alteration in the Church, but the removal of ſuch Accidents, which the Abetters of them do ſay, That *poſſunt adeſſe vel abeſſe ſine ſubjecti interitu*; ſuch Incoherences would not have been expected from ſo Learned a Pen.

Sect. 5. It is alſo unfairly (to ſay no worſe) hinted, That Non-conformiſts Zeal againſt Popery is but pretended, and that the real Deſign is to deſtroy the *Church of England*; we can clear our ſelves of both before a higher Bar, and therefore lay little weight on ſuch Suggeſtions; neither do we meerly diſlike the *Ceremonies*, becauſe they are *Popiſh*; he knoweth that we have other Arguments againſt them; I hope *Non-conformiſts* ſhew their Zeal againſt Popery in other things: Nor do we deſire the *Deſtruction of the Church*, that theſe Ceremonies may fall to the Ground, but the removing of the *Ceremonies* that the *Church* may be more acceptable to him, who can make her ſtand indeſpight of the Gates of Hell. If he charge us with the Church's Ruin, becauſe our *Diviſions* about the *Ceremonies* may tend to it: For anſwer; Let it be conſidered, who giveth culpably the *Riſe* to theſe *Diviſions*, Whether they who forbear the Ceremonies, becauſe Sinful; or, they who do violently impoſe them, tho' Indifferent, in their Apprehenſion: But this will afterwards fall to be further diſcourſed. I deny not, that Papiſts deſign the Ruin of the *Church of England*, but not as *Ceremonious*, but as *Proteſtant*; they do not deſign to deſtroy Her by removing what the Non-conformiſts ſcruple, but by taking away what they agree with Her in: And therefore there is no Cauſe to think, that the removing of the *Ceremonies* (which Non-conformiſts deſire) though under a pretence of Zeal againſt Popery, or under whatever other pretence, ſhould be one of the likelieſt means to bring it in; which our Author feareth.

Sect. 6. The Learned Dr. hath caught this Notion, That *Non-conformiſts*, by their Zeal againſt Popery, are like to be Inſtruments of bringing it in; and he ſeemeth to be very fond of this fine Conceit; runneth away with it at a great rate; is confirmed in it from the proceedings of Papiſts, (*p.* 2.) ſtarteth a Paradox, (*p.* 3.)

As

As it ſeemeth to unthinking People, (like the *Non-conformiſts*) *that when Papiſts can appear no longer in that Work, others out of meer Zeal againſt Popery, ſhould carry it on for them; and theſe unthinking people are carried away with meer no ſe and pretences, and hope thoſe will ſecure them moſt againſt the Fears of Popery, who talk with moſt paſſion, and with leaſt underſtanding againſt it*; and more to this purpoſe. One may think it little Glory for the highly Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* to labour in refuting ſuch a contemptible Adverſary, as he here repreſenteth: But their Wiſdom, and Learning, and Reaſons for what they hold, will (I hope) find more Equitable, and leſs Supercilious Judges in the world; neither will Hectoring ſtop their Mouths, though they are ready to be ſilent to plain Scripture or ſolid Reaſon. He judgeth (*p.* 3, 4.) *That Eaſt and Weſt may meet, and the moſt furious Antagoniſts* (of Popery) *may become ſome of the eaſieſt Converts: Deus avertat omen.* If we may form any Conjecture of what may be, from the Obſervation of what hath been, *eaſie Converſion to Popery* is liker to be found among his own party, who are tame and gentle towards Popery, and no way *furious*. And if any be *furious* againſt it, let them bear their blame. We applaud and practiſe *Rational Zeal* againſt it, but not *Fury*, for *The Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteouſneſs of God.* He cannot get out of this fear concerning many Thouſand zealous Proteſtants: I deny not, but there is cauſe of Fear; for many have got ſound Principles in their Heads, without ſaving Grace in their Hearts; and the Knowledge and Fortitude of moſt is very weak, and the beſt have Cauſe to fear themſelves, and look to him who is able to make them ſtand; but I hope all the Ground of Fear is not on our ſide.

Sect. 7. But now the Learned Author cometh cloſer to his Deſign, *viz.* To lay down Grounds of his Opinion, that he is ſo confirmed in, That the principles and practice of Non-conformiſts do tend to re-introduce *Popery* among us; one is, *That they miſtake what Popery is, being as much afraid of an innocent Ceremony, and of the Croſs, as of real Idolatry: and of Kneeling, as of Adoring the Hoſt.*

Anſ. 1. The Dr. might have known, that the learned Labours of ſome Non-conformiſts againſt Popery, do ſufficiently teſtifie, that they are not ignorant what it is. 2. We generally know, that the Ceremonies are not Popery, but look on them as a part of Popery, but are far from equalling them with ſome other parts of Popery, that are far more groſly evil. 3. We never counted even the

the *nocent* Ceremonies uſed in *England* (for *innocent* Ceremonies, we know none but thoſe of God's Inſtitution) ſo bad as real Idolatry; nor Croſſing and Kneeling, ſo bad as worſhipping Images, tho' we count both ſinful, and dare practiſe neither: Therefore if we ſhould come to ſee our Miſtake in the one Caſe (which we expect not) yet there is no Ground for the Conſequence of this alledged by him, *viz.* That we ſhould ſuſpect our ſelves deceived in the other alſo, unleſs he would ſay that every Diſcovery of a Miſtake that Men make about the ſmalleſt matters in Religion, will ſhake the very Foundation of their Faith; which I hope he will be very far from aſſerting, leſt they that have read his *Irenicum* in former years, and now read his Sermon, and this Defence of it, ſhould inferr that which Good Men will be far from imputing to a perſon of his worth, eſpecially when he doth not deny, but rather own a Change in ſome things now debated, *p.* 72. of the Preface.

Sect. 8. It looketh like another Ground, that Non-conformiſts ſerve the Deſigns of Papiſts, that *When they find the undoubted Practices of the Ancient Church condemned as Popiſh and Antichriſtian, by their Teachers, they muſt conclude Popery to be of much greater Antiquity than really it is, and when they can trace it ſo very near the Apoſtles Times, they will ſoon believe it ſetled by the Apoſtles themſelves.*

Anſ. 1. Here is ſtill a confounding of ſomething that is Popiſh with Popery, a part taken for the whole, an Accident, without which Popery can well conſiſt, and which doth ſubſiſt without Popery, with the body and ſubſtance of Popery. He looketh on his Antagoniſts (according to his wonted Eſteem of them) as very mean Logicians, when he will have them conclude the Antiquity of Popery in thoſe things that he and we do jointly diſlike it in, from the Antiquity of ſome Rites that were uſed under that Apoſtaſie, and which we have continued among us under the Reformation. 2. It were ſtill as bad a Conſequence from our traceing ſome things near to the Apoſtles times, to inferr that they were ſetled by the Apoſtles: For we can make it appear, that not only ſoon after the Apoſtles times, but in their times, ſome things were in the Church that they did not ſetle; as the Love-Feaſts, which they reproved and aboliſhed after that abuſe of them was obſerved. 3. To call thoſe things that Non-conformiſts Scruple, (*Viz.*) The Ceremonies, the undoubted practices of the Ancient Church which may be traced near to the Apoſtles times, is *gratis dictum*, a bold begging of the queſtion: the proof of it we expect.

Sect.

Sect. 9. *It will, saith he,* (*P.* 5.) *be very hard to perſwade conſidering men, that the Chriſtian Church ſhould degenerate ſo ſoon, ſo Unanimouſly and ſo Univerſally, as it muſt do, if Epiſcopacy and the uſe of Significant Ceremonies were any parts of the Apoſtaſie.* Here is ſtill the great Antiquity of theſe things taken for granted but not proved. But further, his *Conſidering men*, if they read and *conſider* the Scripture, will eaſily be perſwaded that a Church may very early and quickly degenerate, and that *Unanimouſly* and *Univerſally*; eſpecially in ſome things that are of leſſer concern in Religion. How ſuddenly did the Church of *Iſrael* degenerate, and *Aaron* with them, when *Moſes* was but 40 days abſent in the Mount, & that in matters of higher moment than what we contend about; even worſhiping a Calf for God? ſee *Ex.* 32. 1. and particularly *Verſ.* 8. And the Lord foretold to *Moſes* their after Apoſtaſies, *Deut.* 31. 16. And *Moſes* took notice of their Apoſtaſies while he was yet with them, and how ſoon they would break out after his departure, 27. 29. How *Quickly*, *Unanimouſly*, and *Univerſally* did the ten Tribes apoſtatize after *Solomon*'s deceaſe? And is not the whole Hiſtory of the Church of *Judah* under her Kings, a witneſs of this? When ever a bad King aroſe, preſently the pure Worſhip of God was turned to Idolatry. In the days of *Joaſh*, as ſoon as *Jehojada* was gone, how quickly did a Faction, with a Complement to the King, turn the whole Nation to Idolatry? 2 *Chron.* 24. 17, 18. Theſe Apoſtaſies were in higher points than we now ſpeak of; and yet, How quickly did the Church thus degenerate? And that this ſhould not be thought ſtrange, even in the Goſpel-Church we may ſee, if we conſider what Chriſt telleth us, of the *Tares ſown while men ſleep*, and growing up inſenſibly, and without Obſervation: Alſo the degeneracy that the Church fell into, even while the Apoſtles were alive, and *faithfully* watching over her; and that, both in *Doctrine* and *Practice*, is evident in the Errours in *Corinth* and *Galatia*; in the Abuſes in publick Adminiſtrations at *Corinth*, inſomuch as the Apoſtle behoved, even in his own time, to make a Reformation, by bringing back to Apoſtolick Example, and the Law of Nature, for reforming ſome Indecencies among them; and to Divine Inſtitution, for reforming their Enormities, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. 20. 23. If theſe evils crept in under the Inſpection of the Apoſtles, What wonder is it if Men afterwards began in ſome things to deviate in Church-practice?

Sect. 10. Yea, the Apoſtle, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. foretelling the Antichriſtian Apoſtacy, *v.* 3. telleth us, That *that Myſtery of iniquity did then work*, *v.* 7. This Allegation the learned Dr. putteth off with a Scoff, *p.* 17. but we muſt not therefore part with it. It is evident, that there was then a tendency among ſome of the Members of the Chriſtian Church to ſeveral of theſe Evils, which being grown up to Maturity of Wickedneſs, Antichriſtianiſm was afterwards made up; not to ſpeak of the groſs Hereſies that then were, and others that were foretold, *Act.* 20. 29, 30. The Ambition of *Diotrephes* was a fermenting toward Lordly Prelacy, 3 *Joh. ver.* 9. So was the Idolizing of ſome Miniſters among the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 4. So the turning aſide to the Jewiſh Ceremonies, a carnal, gawdy ſort of Religion, not contented with the ſimplicity of Goſpel-Worſhip, for which the *Galatians* are reproved, *Gal.* 4. 9. *The worſhipping of Angels, voluntary Humility, ſubjection to Ordinances, touch not, taſte not, handle not, Will-Worſhip, Col.* 2. 18. *Forbidding of Meats and Marriage*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. and in a word, the turning the Spiritual Religion of GOD into a Carnal outward ſhew. All theſe, I ſay, was a working toward the vile Superſtitions that afterward grew up under the Antichriſtian Apoſtaſy, of which our Ceremonies are ſome Remains. Now, if there was ſuch a ſecret working of ſuch Evils in that time, is it any wonder that ſome unallowable practices ſhould be in the Church, ſoon after the Apoſtles, and be little taken notice of?

Sect. 11. And this is yet leſs to be wondred at, if we conſider the defects and uncertainty of the Hiſtory of the Church in Times next after the Apoſtles, as it was in the firſt Times of the Church, before the Law, which the Jews call יְמֵי תֹהוּ , *Dies inanitatis*, becauſe of the want of the Light of Hiſtory. It was little better with the Chriſtian Church at firſt. We have very little diſtinct account of her Order; and what we have, is but in ſome things, not ſo full as to enable us to paſs a Judgment with Confidence of all their Practices in Church-Adminiſtrations: It is no good Argument, there is no mention of Diſſent from, or Non-conformity to the Church-practices of the Firſt Times; *ergo* there was none; eſpecially conſidering that the Writers of thoſe Times (who were glorious Lights, yet Men, and ſubject to miſtakes and paſſions) would not readily give account of what might make againſt their own practices. And it can be made appear, that the beſt of the Church Guides, after the Apoſtles, were in miſtakes greater than what we

now

now ſcruple at: But the early Degeneracy of the Chriſtian Church (which our Author thinks it ſo abſurd to imagine) is witneſſed by the moſt ancient Hiſtory, and neareſt to theſe Times. *Euſebius, lib. 3. c. 29.* relating out of *Egeſippus* the Martyrdom of *Simon* Son of *Cleopas*, ſecond Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who had ſeen the Lord, and was his Couſin-*Germain*, he addeth, that *After that the Sacred Company of the Apoſtles were worn out, the Church having before been a pure Virgin, the Conſpiracy of deteſtable Errors, through Deceit of ſuch as delivered ſtrange Doctrine, took rooting*, &c. If Hereſie ſo ſoon got head, what Abſurdity is it to think that leſſer Evils might early prevail? This may be alſo proved in reference to the Rites uſed in the Church, how early there was a degeneracy in theſe, out of *Irenæus*, who lived in the ſecond Century, *Epiſt. ad Victor. Epiſc. Rom. Quæ varietas obſervantiæ (paſcatis, & jejuniorum) non nunc primum neq; noſtris temporibus cœpit, ſed multo ante nos (ut opinor) qui non ſimpliciter quod ab initio traditum eſt tenentes, in alium morem vel per negligentiam, vel per imperitiam poſtmodum decidere.* Where it is evident, that *Irenæus* imputeth ſuch negligence and unskilfulneſs even to the Firſt Age, and neareſt to the Apoſtles, if not in the days of ſome of them, as made them fall from Chriſts Inſtitution in ſome things. The conſideration of all which maketh me wonder at the Confidence of the learned Author, who ſaith, that *So ſudden and inſenſible a Change of the Church is ſo incredible, that they that think it could be, may on the ſame Grounds believe that other parts of Popery did as ſoon prevail.* That this Change did ſoon prevail, we believe not, but that it might, we ſee no Abſurdity in it; and for other parts of Popery, we can tell when moſt of them begun, and therefore are not obliged from the Antiquity of one part of it, to acknowledge the ſame of another; neither is there any Inconveniency in aſſerting, that theſe Miſtakes crept in inſenſibly. Seeing the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of them as a Myſtery that was long working, before it came above-board. What he ſaith of humane Policies keeping long to their firſt Inſtitution, maketh little to his purpoſe, both becauſe the contrary is moſt frequently obſerved; they often degenerate, and that unobſerved by the Vulgar, through the Cunning of Statesmen; and becauſe corrupt Nature is not ſo apt to deviate from Humane Conſtitutions, as from thoſe that are Divine. Few Politick Frames have been ſo often, and quickly, and eaſily changed, as the Religious Worſhip of the Jews was, in the time of the Judges and Kings. I hope by this time it will appear, that the Principles

of the *Church's Enemies* (ſo he falſly calleth the *Non-conformiſts*, who are no Enemies to the Church, but to her humane Ceremonies) bringeth no ſuch mighty prejudice on the Cauſe of the Reformation, as he with confidence inferreth from what he had diſcourſed; for we neither own ſuch Antiquity in the Ceremonies; nor, if we did, would that inferr the Antiquity of Popery in its groſſer parts.

Sect. 12. He again chargeth his Adverſaries, that *They muſt forgo the Teſtimony of Antiquity, and that by ſo doing they run into inſuperable Difficulties in dealing with the Papiſts, which his Principles do lead through; for they can juſtly charge Popery as Innovation.* And to that purpoſe citeth Biſhop *Sanderſon* (*p.* 6.) In anſwer to him and the Biſhop too, We ſay, 1. That we do not forgo the Teſtimony of Antiquity; though we do not Idolize it, as ſome do; we will not be concluded by it againſt Scripture, and not often without Scripture, but take its help to ſearch into the Mind of God revealed in His Word: Its greateſt Admirers muſt needs forgo it ſometimes, both Papiſts and Prelatiſts; and the ancient Authors themſelves do not ſeldom diſown all Authority in them or any men to determine in the Controverſies of Religion: But I ſhall not digreſs into this Debate, What Weight is to be laid on Antiquity; it is enough at preſent that we deny, and our Adverſaries have not proved (nor ſhall they ever be able to prove) that Biſhops and Ceremonies are ſo ancient as they affirm them to be; what Inſtances he intendeth, or can give from his preſent Adverſaries, (the Non-conformiſts) *that they maintain ſuch principles as deſtroy the Juſtice and Equity of the Reformation*, I know not; when we meet with them, we ſhall conſider them; mean while we profeſs our ſelves ready to diſown all Principles that can be made appear to be of that tendency.

Sect. 13. Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s three ways how Non-conformiſts promote Popery eventually, tho' not intentionally, which he mentioneth, *p.* 7. are ſuch as to unbyaſſed men will ſeem unworthy of the learned Biſhop to propoſe, or the learned Dr. to applaud; the firſt is, *By helping to pull down Epiſcopacy, at which*, he ſaith, Rome *rejoiced*. But, will any ſay that this Joy of *Rome* was becauſe Epiſcopacy is ſuch an Enemy to Popery; when they have it as well as we, and when it is not to be ſeen in any Proteſtant Church as in *England*? yea, I muſt ſay, Except in *England*. Is it not obvious, that their Joy was for our Broils on that occaſion, and not for the Ruin of that which they love ſo well? Will any deny that *Rome* rejoiced as much at the pulling down of Presbytery in *Scotland*, and the hindrance

drance of its Settlement in *England*, for our Changes, Anarchy, and Confuſions are their Advantage? The Second is, *Their oppoſing the intereſt of* Rome, *with more Violence than Reaſon.* The Third is, *Their frequent miſtaking the Queſtion, eſpecially through the neceſſity of ſome falſe Principles, which they will maintain, whatever come of the common Cauſe of the Reformation.* It is not eaſie to reply to theſe; I ſhall only ſay, there is no Truth in what is here ſaid, nor the Candour becoming a Diſputant, in ſaying of it, without any pretence to proving it. Let not the Dr. think that the Biſhop's αὐτὸς ἔφη will convince us; the Folly and Indiſcretion that he is pleaſed next to grieve us with the Imputation of, and to back again with the ſame learned Biſhop's Authority, (*p.* 8.) is another of his Arguments, which we will not attempt to anſwer, ſave with the words of *Pſal.* 123. 3, 4. *Have mercy upon us, O Lord, have mercy upon us, for we are exceedingly filled with contempt, our Soul is exceedingly filled with the ſcorning of thoſe that are at eaſe, and with the contempt of the proud.* What he after mentioneth of the Popiſh Inſtruments, being for the moſt violent courſes, doth not concern us, who endure, but uſe no Violence: Let them look to it, who with ſuch Violence do preſs their Brethren in things acknowledged Indifferent, which they think unlawful, and ruine them for not yielding. What Service this may do to the Papiſts, who are ſuch Lovers of *Violent Courſes*, let the World judge. The *Jews*, by indiſcreet zeal, brought the *Romans* on them, which they deſigned to ſhun: If he will prove our zeal againſt Popery to be alſo indiſcreet, we ſhall endure the parallel. He cannot get that Notion out of his Head, (*p.* 9.) that was met before, That Non-conformiſts attempt to overthrow the Conſtitution of the Church, becauſe they are againſt the Ceremonies. What Service this may do the Papiſts, may be conſidered: to make the *Proteſtant Religion*, which, I ſuppoſe, doth conſtitute the *Church of England*, have a Trifle (ſuch an Indifferent Ceremony muſt be) for ſuch a part of her Conſtitution, as with it ſhe is overturned, they will be apt to inferr, that we reckon our Religion a Trifle. Let it be conſidered, whether talking at this rate doth not look liker a *Tranſport*, than what can be juſtly charged on the Non-conformiſts.

Sect. 14. Who doubteth but the Papiſts *envy the Church of* England, and *wiſh her torn in pieces*, and *wiſh there were no Biſhops in* England, and that *they have endeavoured to deſtroy her Conſtitution and Government?* But what is all that to the purpoſe? Doth it hence follow, that they who diſlike her *Biſhops* and *Ceremonies* are doing

the ſame Work? The Tendency (much leſs the Deſigns) of Papiſts and Non-conformiſts can never be drawn into one Channel, till he prove, that it is the *Ceremonies* of the *Church of England* that Papiſts aim to deſtroy, and not the *Proteſtant Religion* in it; and that their ſpight at the *Engliſh Biſhops*, is, not becauſe they are *Proteſtant Biſhops*, but becauſe they are Biſhops. It may, with as much ſhew of Reaſon, be ſaid, That a Phyſician promoteth the deſign of his Patient's Enemy, who aimeth to kill him, whereas the Phyſician's Work is, to remove his Diſeaſe; both would have the Man what he is not, but there is no Concurrence between them, either in their intention or tendency of their Work. What followeth doth as little prove his point, as I ſhall ſhew by brief Anſwers to his Queſtions: *Did not* Cranmer, Ridley, *&c. ſuffer Martyrdom by their* (the Papiſts) *means? Anſ.* Yes, but not becauſe *Biſhops*, but as *Proteſtants. Did not they own the ſame Epiſcopacy which is now among us, and which men by Book upon Book ſeek to deſtroy?* (p. 10.) *Anſ.* That may be a Queſtion, but I now ſuppoſe they did: theſe worthy Servants of God had Reformed much, but left this Unreformed; they did worthily in their Generation, yet as Men who are Imperfect, we may rather wonder, that in that time of Darkneſs, which they had been born in, and under the prejudices of their Education, they diſcovered ſo much of Errour, than that they in that Crowd of Corruptions that they had to purge out, over-looked this.

Sect. 15. Some further Argumentative Queſtions he moveth; *Is all this* (writing againſt Biſhops and Ceremonies) *done for the honour of the Reformation? Is this the way to preſerve the Proteſtant Religion among us, to fill mens minds with ſuch prejudices againſt the firſt Settlement of it, and to make the World believe, that the Church-Government then Eſtabliſhed, was repugnant to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and that our Martyr-Biſhops exerciſed an unlawful Authority over Dioceſan Churches? But whither will Mens indiſcreet Zeal carry them?* Here's a Tragical Outcry, as if Non-conformiſts went about to deſtroy Religion, becauſe they are not for *Biſhops* and *Ceremonies*: What a ſtrange unaccountable fondneſs have theſe Men for their *Diana*, who talk at this rate! If this Diſcourſe have any Nerves, it will at once condemn all theſe, as the worſt Enemies that true Religion hath, who have found any fault in a Reformed Church, as if it were a thing impoſſible, that a *True Reformation* ſhould be an *Imperfect Reformation*. But thus it is with Men who have left Scripture-Guidance, and become fond of Humane Authority in Religious Matters

ters. We honour the Reformers, but do not Idolize their Perſons; where they follow Scripture, we follow them, (and the Apoſtle required no more of his Followers, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1.) but where they recede from the Rule we muſt needs Diſſent.

Sect. 16. It may very much clear us, & ſilence ſuch Clamours of our Adverſaries, if we conſider that the *Engliſh* is not the only *Imperfect Reformation*, that hath been in the World, and that what our Author here alledgeth, would equally juſtifie all their defects, and condemn all Endeavours after further nearneſs to Primitive Inſtitution. To give ſome Inſtances, How many Reformations do we read of in the Jewiſh Church, which no doubt were approved of God, and rejoiced in by Good Men, in ſo far, as they were a caſting off of falſe Gods, and a worſhipping of *Jehovah*, and yet had this *nigrum Theta* ſet on them by the Spirit of God, that *the high places ſtill remained, and the People ſtill Sacrificed in them*; yet only to *Jehovah*. This is noted even of *Solomon*, 1 *Kin.* 3. 2, 3. (and it's like it was one of his firſt Steps of Degeneracy, tho' the want of a Temple might ſeem to have excuſed it; yet it is noted as a Fault, as *Piſcator* obſerveth, and the Particle רַק, *attamen, only*, importeth no leſs.) It is alſo noted of *Manaſſeth*, in his laſt and beſt daies, 2 *Chron.* 33. 17. and of *Azariah*, 2 *King.* 15. 5. and of *Jotham*, 2 *King.* 15. 35. and of many others, which need not be mentioned. Now is it imaginable, that none of the Godly in *Judah* were diſſatisfied with this Depravation of God's Worſhip, nor ſcrupled to leave the Temple, and to go to the high places to worſhip; and if there were any ſuch, Might not all this be applied to them? *Was it for the Honour of the Reformation? Was that the way to preſerve the Worſhip of* Jehovah? *Muſt Reformers be charged with a wrong Way of Worſhip?* If this had been an inſignificant Declamation againſt them, ſo is it now againſt us. To come nearer home, Do not all the ſoundeſt *Proteſtants* rejoice in the *Lutheran* Reformation, as to the main, and yet blame it in ſome things? Were not all Engliſh Proteſtants glad of what King *Hen.* 8. did againſt the Pope, and in ſome other points of Religion, and yet they thought not fit ſo to applaud that Setlement, as to look after no further Reformation: Why then ſhould it be thought in us a diſgracing of the Reformation, that we deſire ſome things to be ſtill mended?

Sect. 17. We thank him for his Charity, that *he will not ſay, that we are ſet on by the Jeſuites*, but miſregard his Saying, That we do their Work; a groundleſs and unproved Aſſertion. I wiſh there

were

were no Ground for Recrimination, which I ſhall forbear: If his *Forty Years Meditation* have enabled him to prove the preſent *Epiſcopacy* agreeable to the Inſtitution of *Chriſt*, and to the beſt Churches, we muſt yield the Cauſe, but we intend to hear his Proofs firſt. It is a needleſs Queſtion that he asketh, *Wherein doth our Church differ from its firſt Setlement?* Seeing he knoweth that we blame the firſt Setlement, *eatenus*, tho' we applaud it in the main; and what he cited out of Dr. *Taylor* the Martyr (*p.* 11.) ſaith no more, but that ſome Holy Men diſcovered the Evil of Popery, and laid down their Lives in oppoſition to it, but had not yet come to ſee the Evil of ſome of the Appurtenances of Popery. Dr. *Taylor* and others rejoiced to ſee God worſhipped in Engliſh, which had been in Latin, as by Parrots, but did not ſee the Evil of ſuch a Frame of Worſhip, having known no other. So the ſame Dr. *Taylor*, when Bp. *Bonner* was about degrading him, Swore by St. *Peter*, (*Acts and Monuments*, p. 174.) as *Joſeph* by the Life of *Pharaoh*, but that doth not juſtifie ſuch a practice.

Sect. 18. He now undertaketh (*p.* 11, *&c.*) to make it appear, that the *Jeſuitical Party* had a great hand in the beginning of the *Separation*, (as he calleth it.) How doth this conſiſt with what he had ſaid, *That he will not ſay, that we are ſet on by the Jeſuits?* That Papiſts did not Separate at firſt in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Daies, we can give no Account, knowing that Policy, not Conſcience, often governeth their Actions. That *Non-conformiſts* did go along with the *Church* in all her practices, he largely inſiſteth on afterward, and there it is to be conſidered whether it was ſo, or not; and if ſo, what is our Concern in it. He telleth a long Story of *Jeſuits* imployed under the Diſguiſe of *more zealous Proteſtants*, to oppoſe the Liturgy, *&c.* and to ſet up a *Separation*; the truth of which I ſhall not diſpute; for it hath alwaies been the way of that active party to endeavour the Dividing of them that are not of their Communion. But, I know not what Blame that can reflect upon the *Non-conformiſts*, or their practices; I do not doubt, the ſame party had a hand in the Diviſions of *Calviniſts* from *Lutherans*, and are willing to take all occaſions to divide, that they may ruin; but if the Lord turn it to Good, and to their Diſappointment, and if his Servants keep his Way, while they part from the way of other Men, let the *Jeſuits* do their worſt, and let us do our Duty, there is neither harm nor blame in it. Were it not very eaſie for us, if we had any confidence in ſuch Arguments, to ſhew what a hand *Jeſuits* ha e in

ſet-

ſetting on our Adverſaries, in ſuch peremptory cleaving to their *Indifferent Ceremonies*, that they will rather ſee the Church torn in a thouſand pieces, than part with one of them; and in proſecuting Men, tho' never ſo ſound in the Articles of the Church's Doctrine, and Innocent and Holy in their Converſation, becauſe they cannot yield over the Belly of Scripture-Light, and of their Conſciences, to the Uſe of theſe Trifles: Doth not this look more like a Deſign of *Jeſuits* to embroil the Church, that they may ruine her; while ſuch meaſures are unaccountable, and the Admiration of all the Reformed Churches that behold our Differences?

Sect. 19. Whether the Papers he ſpeaketh of, and the Confeſſion of *Heath* the *Jeſuit*, and the Letter mentioned, have any thing of Truth, or be a Sham (as many ſuch things have been in our daies) it were ſuch a wild-Gooſe chaſe to follow forth the Enquiry, as I do not hope to come to the end of it; and it were not *Operæ pretium* to find the Truth of it. That *Coleman*, *Hallingham*, and *Benſon* are named in the Letter, and alſo recorded by Mr. *Fuller*, and others as forward *Non-conformiſts*, proveth no more, but that the cunning *Jeſuits* knew how to inſinuate into the moſt Unwary, as theſe with *Button* are repreſented to be, by their forwardneſs beyond others, as appeareth, *Fuller's Ch. Hiſt. Book* 9. *Pag.* 81. & *Pag.* 108. Where he ſaith, they out-did all of their own Opinion: And was there ever a Party, among whom ſome might not be found fit Tools by their Indiſcretion, to be imployed by cunning Artificers, for raiſing Troubles, without caſting a Reflection of Blame on the whole Party? But our Author ſhould have at the ſame time taken notice out of the ſame *Hiſtorian*, *p.* 76. that the Biſhops in 5 *Eliz.* 1563. being impowered by their Canons, began to urge Subſcriptions to the *Liturgy*, *Ceremonies*, and *Diſcipline of the Church*, and by ſo doing gave Riſe to theſe Mens, and others, appearing as they did, and branded the Refuſers with the odious Name of *Puritans*. P. 102. he ſheweth, that the ſame Canons being now, (Nine Years after) ratified by *Parliament*; *The Biſhops began to urge Subſcription more ſeverely than before, which made many Diſſenters keep their private Meetings in Fields, Woods, their Friends Houſes, &c.* And may not one rationally think, that the *Jeſuits* might (in their own way) prompt the *Biſhops* to this Severity, as well as the *Diſſenters* not to yield to it?

Sect. 20. The notions that *Jeſuits* have of *Spiritual Prayer*, mentioned, p. 15. (ſome of them extravagant enough) the learned Dr. uſeth

uſeth as a reproach to the *Non-conformiſts*; how rationally, let the World judge, ſeeing we never vented nor owned ſuch Fancies; only we think *Set Forms of Prayer* unfit to be uſed, where Miniſters are tolerably gifted to pray without them; and that all the praying that we read of, to have been either practiſed or commended in the *Apoſtolick Church*, was without Book, the Spirit, not the Book, helping their Infirmities, even as to what they are to pray for, or the Matter of Prayer, *Rom.* 8. 26. When he ſaith (p. 16.) that *It is not improbable the Jeſuits were the firſt Setters up of this way in* England; *and that it was never known here, or in any other Reformed Church before this time.* If he mean *Prayer without a Set-form*, (if he mean any thing elſe, it is not to the purpoſe) it is a raſh and untrue Aſſertion; Was ever Prayer without Book condemned by any *Reformed Church*? Yea; Can any *Reformed Church* be inſtanced where it hath not been, and is not uſed? Or, let him mention, a *Reformed Church* that hath reſtrained *Extemporary Prayer*, and impoſed a *Set-form*. But this Debate he reſumeth afterward, and till then, we ſhall leave it; it doth not favour of that due regard to the Spirit of Prayer, that is promiſed to be poured out on the people of God, *Zech.* 12. 10. to mock the uſing of his help, to pray without a Book, as a *Charm Effectual with judicious People*, and to jeer the *zeal* and *warmth of Devotion* that appeareth in it: Many know the Advantage of what he thinketh but a Fancy; let him abound in his own Senſe, for, *De guſtibus non eſt diſputandum.* If by means of this manner of worſhipping God, *the Diviſion wonderfully encreaſed*, as he ſaith, I hope it was not the Debauched nor Unſerious that were ſo taken with that way, and therefore this Encreaſe was no reproach to it.

Sect. 21. He citeth the Admonition given in to the *Parliament*, 14 *Eliz.* of which he ſaith the Authors (Mr. *Fuller*'s Church-Hiſtory, p. 102, 103. maketh Mr. *Thomas Cartwright* Author both of the firſt and ſecond *Admonition*) *would have neither Papiſts nor others conſtrained to communicate.* I do not underſtand whether any perſon ſhould be conſtrained to partake of the *Lord's Supper*, (for I ſuppoſe that is meant) otherwiſe than by forcible perſwaſions, which is the *Compulſion* meant, *Luk.* 14. 23. *Brugenſis* ſaith, it expreſſeth *vim evangelij*; ſo others, That Ordinance was never appointed by the Lord to be a Teſt of a Man's Profeſſion, while he is uncapable to improve it to higher ends. But if the *Admonition* plead for *Tolerating* of *Popery*, (I have not the book by me, and therefore cannot

not determine in this) we are far from approving it. Though we think we have a Right, by the Goſpel, not only to *Toleration*, but *further Countenance* for our way; yet, if we might chuſe, we had rather be under the ſevereſt *Perſecution*, than have the leaſt hand in obtaining Liberty to that *Idolatry*: We muſt not do, yea, nor wiſh Evil, that Good may come. What he citeth out of Archb. *Whitgift*, and Archb. *Grindal*, p. 17, 18. I look on as Invectives againſt the *Nonconformiſts* of the ſame ſtamp with his own; they are Parties, and therefore not to be adduced as Witneſſes. Dr. *Sutcliſe* ſaith no more than we will ſay, that *our Diviſions give advantage to the Papiſts*: Let them who are the culpable Cauſe of the *Diviſions* look to it. The *Prophecy* cited out of Mr. *Solden*, is to the ſame purpoſe, and needeth no other Anſwer.

Sect. 22. The politick, helliſh Advices given by the *Jeſuit Contzen*, and *Seignior Ballarini*, make nothing againſt us at all, tho' he filleth *p.* 19, 20, 21. with them; for all that can be thence inferred is, That they labour to divide *Proteſtants*, and this *Diviſion* falleth out according to their wiſh. Now the *Diviſion* hath its Riſe from the *Impoſitions* of one party that aſſume the Name of the *Church*, and the *Scruples* of another party. If the *Church* impoſe that which is lawful and neceſſary, and the other party ſcruple that, and ſo *divide*; in that caſe the *Diſſenters* muſt bear the blame of the *Diviſion*, and are guilty of *co-operating with the common Enemy, in ruining the Proteſtant Religion*: But if the *Church*, by Her *Impoſitions*, burden the Conſciences of Her Members with things that She counteth *Indifferent*, (*i. e.*) *Needleſs*, and the *Scruplers* reckon as *unlawful*, and have juſt ground ſo to do; then the blame of Separating, and of helping the Papiſts to ruin our Religion, lieth at the *Church*'s door; wherefore all this might have been ſpared. Let the learned *Dr.* ſoundly refute our Principles, and then caſt what blame he will on us; but till that be done, (which we expect not) let him take heed where the blame will be laid, when the Secrets of Men ſhall be judged. It may be obſerved in theſe Advices, that the *Jeſuits*, as their Maſter the Devil often doth, ſpeak ſome Truths out of a bad end.

Sect. 23. Next he cometh (*p.* 22.) to reproach us with the *Indulgence* that was granted *March*, 167½. as *being procured by the Papiſts*. If any *Non-conformiſts* had a hand in procuring *Liberty* (which I do not believe) to them, I think their Brethren will diſown them in that Act. That *Papiſts* had a hand in it, is not improbable, both for

 their

their own eaſe, and to make the *Difference* among *Proteſtants* the more conſpicuous: But was it fit, that we ſhould forbear a neceſſary Duty becauſe of their ill Deſign? We did not join in the practices of the Church before that, but worſhipped God after his own *Inſtitution*, without *Humane Ceremonies*: All the Change in our way on that Occaſion was, that what before we had done in corners, and with hazard, then we did ſafely and openly; and, what fault was in this? But, *One ſaith, that the Presbyterians ſuſpected the kindneſs, and joined with the Conformiſts, like wiſe Men, and refuſed the Bait:* Who ſaid ſo, or on what Ground, I know not; we went no further from the *Conformiſts*, than *Conſcience* of Duty had made us do before; but it had been a ſtrange thing, if when *Liberty* was granted us to worſhip God in his own way, we had then joined with a *Superſtitious Worſhip*, which we could not do before. If that Author mean, That *Presbyterians* were then willing to concurr with the *Conformiſts*, as their Proteſtant Brethren, in all things lawful, to diſappoint the Deſigns of the common Enemy, we approve of that *Inclination*, and think the Dr. cannot charge us with any thing to the contrary in practice: Wherefore it is without all Reaſon, that he dateth the *Presbyterian Separation from that time*, p. 23. Their *building Meeting-houſes, and uſing Separate Meetings*, p. 24. will not prove it; for the one they did before, and the other was but a more publick owning of what was their private practice, when under the laſh of the Perſecution. Defending their practice by writing, is no proof neither: If he can prove, that they do it *on Principles that will juſtifie any Separation*, let them be blamed; but this, I ſuppoſe, dropt from his Pen without due conſideration. That they chuſe Miniſters one after another, is as little proof as the reſt; how to judge I know not, of what his *credible Perſon* informs him, *Of ten Miniſters coming into one City*. It is a hard Caſe, when Miniſters put to great hardſhips by the *Five Mile Act*, that it being ſuſpended, they might not live in Corporations for their Accommodation. Let the Author of the *Peaceable Deſign* (cited p. 25.) anſwer for himſelf; I am ſure, ſuch *Non-conformiſts* as I have converſed with, never approved of the *Tolerating of Papiſts*.

Sect. 24. Mr. *Nye* is produced (p. 27.) as owning, that *Jeſuits* had a hand in our *Diviſions* (whoever denied it) in perſwading the unlawfulneſs of hearing the Conformiſts preach. Whoever broached that Principle, it was never received among the more ſober and intelligent of the *Non-conformiſts*, eſpecially the *Presbyterians*; it

it is their *Corruptings of God's Ordinances*, not their diſpenſing of them, that we refuſe to join with them in; and when we cannot join in the one without the other, we muſt forbear both; which is by a neceſſity from them, not our choice; but of this he will give fitter occaſion to ſpeak afterward. What he citeth out of Mr. *Baxter*, p. 28, 29. 30. tho' there be Expreſſions of the keen Spirit of that learned Writer, which might have been a little ſoftened, yet all that he ſaith, proveth no more but this; From among the *Non-conformiſts* have gone out ſome Sects, that by their unſound principles have given advantage to the common Enemy, which we deny not, but lament; but if this prove our way evil, and tending to *Popery*, the ſame muſt be concluded againſt the *Reformation from Popery*, where the *German Anabaptiſts* ſprung up; yea, *Chriſtianity* ſhall not eſcape, for did not *Gnoſticks*, and other like Hereticks, ariſe from among Chriſtians, even in the Apoſtle's days?

Sect. 25. The Dr. (p. 31.) triumphantly appealeth to any impartial Reader, *Who muſt ſerve the Popiſh Deſigns, thoſe who keep to the Conſtitution of the Church of* England, *or thoſe who fell into the courſe of ſeparation.* I hope the Judge that he conſtituteth, having conſidered his Allegations, and the Anſwers hitherto diſcourſed, will acquit us of all acceſſion to *Popiſh Deſigns*; but if we ſhould take as much pains to retort the ſame blame on his party, as he hath done to accuſe us, it were eaſie to gueſs where the Sentence of *Condemnation* would fall; but I delight not in ſuch unbrotherly work, and there is the leſs need for it, that *day unto day uttereth ſpeech*, to diſcover the ſidings of that party with the Enemies of our Religion: That the Papiſts deſigned to force all to ſeek a general *Toleration*, is not unlikely; but that *Non-conformiſts* did deſire or ſeek it, is unjuſtly inſinuated.

Sect. 26. When I conſider what he writeth (p. 33, 34.) I ſee cauſe to retort his own words on him, which he uſeth, p. 23. *If ſuch bold and notorious untruths are publiſhed now, what account may we expect will be given to Poſterity of the paſſages of theſe Times?* He doth repreſent the *Non-conformiſts* very *unfairly*, if not very *falſly*; as that on the Diſcovery of the Popiſh Plot, the *Non-conformiſts* ſeemed to be *Like men roufed out of a deep ſleep, amazed, confounded, fearful of every thing, miſtruſting all that were not in ſuch a conſternation as themſelves.* VVere they not as vigilant and jealous over the Papiſts, as other Proteſtants even before that time? Yea; who that will ſee, doth not know that they exceeded their Neighbours in this; he hath forgotten what he

had before ſo often declaimed againſt them, That they pretended to be the moſt zealous *Proteſtants* about their fear of Popery, their indiſcreet zeal againſt it, *&c.* with which he beſprinkles moſt of his pages: But now, of a ſudden, they are transformed into a ſort of Men aſleep, having neither fear of, nor zeal againſt it. How doth paſſion blind men? *Impedit ira animum, &c.* Their fear and conſternation on the diſcovery of the Plot, is as groundleſly affirmed as their ſleep before it: No doubt, they were apprehenſive of Danger, as all the Proteſtant Nation were, and ſtill are; but what Signs of ſuch Diſorder was among them, he doth not ſay, becauſe he could not; therefore a general Accuſation was more apt to calumniate them by. But it may be (and it is beyond a may be) they faſted and prayed more than ſome others did on this occaſion, and that ſome reckon a ſign of Guilt and Fear, beyond what is to be found in good men. Some (ſaith he) in this caſe preſſed the Diſſenters to ſtudy Union among Proteſtants; But were they then, or ever, backward to it on ſinleſs terms? or, would they have had them abandon the light of their Conſciences for Peace-ſake in that time of danger? He again chargeth the *Non-conformiſts*, that *Formerly they carried ſmoothly towards the common and innocent Papiſts, as they ſtiled them, and thought them equally capable of Toleration with themſelves.* It were well done in the Dr. if he can make this appear againſt any one *Non-conformiſt*; but if it be ſpoken with reference to them in general, nothing can be more *calumnious*. It is of the ſame ſtamp that followeth, p. 34. *Their trucking under-hand for Toleration with the Papiſts; they repreſent*, ſaith he, *thoſe of the Church of* England, *as Papiſts in Maſquerade.* Did ever any *Non-conformiſt* talk at this rate of *Conformiſts* in general, as he would have his Readers believe? And if it have been ſaid of ſome, and thoſe of no mean degree in the Church, time partly hath tried, and it is like, will further try the truth of it; I commend his Humanity, and being free of undue heat againſt the Papiſts, on occaſion of that *horrid Plot*. If there was *due heat*, we require no more; but he doth moſt injuriouſly charge us with rage and fierceneſs in that caſe: I know not, that the wiſe and ſober among the *Non-conformiſts* (if he will let it be ſaid, that there be any ſuch among them) did exceed due bounds of the zeal of God againſt ſuch a party of his Enemies. He next fighteth with the popular Cenſures that then paſſed on many of the *Clergy*, which we are not concerned in. I wiſh him to conſider, that as ſometimes *vox populi* is *vox diaboli*, ſo alſo not ſeldom it is *vox Dei*.

Sect.

Sect. 27. He hopeth that the *Non-conformist* Miniſters (whom he taunteth as high pretenders to, and ſelf-applauders in wiſdom and ſelf-denial) *would in ſo critical a Time have joined with them againſt the common Enemy, or let them know their Senſe of the preſent State of things.* Except in their *Ceremonies*, the *Non-conformiſts* were never backward to join with them, and much leſs at that time; for letting the *Church-men* know their ſenſe of things, I know not what occaſion they had for that, except in their Sermons, in which they were as plain and faithful againſt Popery, as their Brethren were. He next falleth heavily on the *Plea for Peace*, and *true and only way of Concord*, as moſt *Unſeaſonable* and *Diviſive* pieces. The Author of theſe Books is of age and ability to anſwer for himſelf, and yet living and writing: I need ſay nothing for him, only this I make bold to ſay, abating the vehemency of the ſtile, and forwardneſs of that learned man's *genius*, which ſometimes run into over-laſhes, that another cannot ſo well defend as himſelf; for the ſubſtance of the Books, let the Dr. try it when he will, he may poſſibly find it a hard-enough Task to deal with them. What that Author ſaith in the name of the whole party, (which the Dr. taketh advantage from, p. 37.) doth not oblige the party further than they ſee Cauſe to own it.

Sect. 28. The Reverend Dr. doth begin, p. 39. to give account of the occaſion and Deſign of his *Sermon*, which was anſwered by ſeveral Hands, and in defence of which, this Book now under our conſideration was written: I ſhall concern my ſelf little about it, being ready to give all poſſible Charity to the deſign of ſo worthy a perſon, in undertaking and managing that Affair. I ſhall conſider what is ſaid on this occaſion, no further than ſhall be needful to the defence I now manage of our preſent way. It is moſt injurious that he aſſerteth, that (by ſuch Books as he had mentioned) *the zeal of many was turned off from the Papiſts againſt thoſe of the Church.* Is there any thing in theſe Books that favoureth Papiſts? or any thing that maketh the Church of *England* worſe than that of *Rome?* If withdrawing from the Corruptions of the Church be defended, this hath no tendency to leſſen Zeal againſt Papiſts. He that complaineth of hard uſage, (tho' without cauſe) ſhould not ſo retaliate, as to call his Brethren, who differ from him, and give reaſons for their ſo doing, *an enraged, but unprovoked company of Men.* This, and much of that nature, we reſolve patiently to bear. He muſt give us leave to deny what he imputeth to our way, p. 40. That *It is a great,*

dange-

dangerous, and unaccountable Separation: If his Arguments against it prove as hard as his Words, it will not be easie to stand before him; if this be to *touch us with a soft and gentle hand*, as, *ibidem*, what will his severities prove? Sure he hath forgot himself, when with the same breath he calleth us *peevish and partial men*, and saith, *he resolved to give us no just provocation by reproachful Language, or personal Reflections.*

Sect. 29. The *Unseasonableness* of this *make-bate Sermon* is objected, which he attempteth to disprove with a Flood of Words, all built on this Foundation; *That the Church was reviled, run down by a popular Fury, &c.* This is the usual respect the learned Dr. is pleased to treat his *Antagonists* with. Other men think, that a *modest Dissent and with-holding Communion in unlawful things*, backed with solid Reasons given for so doing, was all that the *Non-conformists* were guilty of; and that, that needed not give such an *Alarm* as if there had been *a Design to ruin the Church*, as he fansieth; and unbyassed men will think, that such a Sermon, on purpose chosen to be preached before the Magistrate, rather than before his Ordinary Hearers, doth not savour so much of a design to guard the Consciences of the People against *Non-conformity*, as of some other Design; what that was, may be easily guessed at, for all that is said to the contrary. I speak now of the *Tendency of the thing*, rather than of the *Intention of the person*; but I rather chuse to wave this matter than contend about it, being more concern'd about the Truth of what was said, than the Season of Saying it. I shall be as little concerned about the sharpness and severity of his *Sermon*, which is the other Objection that he answereth from p. 44. though I am sure, what I have already noted in this Preface, sheweth, that such a way of treating Dissenters is not *ab hoc homine alienum*; but I must do him that right, as to acknowledge, that there is more mildness expressed in the *Sermon* than here, he being galled by the pungent Reasons of his Answerers; yet there wants not some *Vinegar* in the *Ink* that the *Sermon* was written with; but, I confess, that is so common a fault among imperfect men, that we must say, *Veneam damus petimusq; vicissim*; for my part, I study to shun it, but if I be overtaken in this fault, I am willing to be admonished and corrected. We think Schism as great a Sin as the Dr. doth; and seeing he thinketh the blame of it is on our part, I judge it but consequent to that Opinion that he exposed it, (and us by reason of it) with all its Aggravations; and if we cannot clear our selves in this mat-

matter, let us lie under as much blame as he can load us with. But withal, I hope he will remember, that if the *Schism* be caused by the fault of his party, all the sad imports of his excellent Discourse will return on his own Head, and those of his way: Wherefore I wish all this had been waved, and the merits of the Cause only minded.

Sect. 30. The Expression that his Adversaries are so offended with (to wit) that he saith (p. 49.) *The most godly People among them can least endure to be told of their faults*; is, as I think, not sufficiently vindicated, by saying, that *He meant it of them who will not hear their own Teachers telling them of the sin of Separation*; as Mr. *B.* alledgeth; for they that are so unteachable, are not the most godly of the *Non-conformists*: I hope there are among them who can hear Sin of whatever sort charged on them, and soberly consider what is said; and if on Enquiry they be convinced of a fault, will humble themselves, and confess, if not, will soberly clear their Innocency by Reasons. Far less is it a fit Vindication of this Assertion, to apply what he had said to Dr. *O.* Mr. *B.* Mr. *A.* and the rest of the Answerers of his Sermon. I hope he doth not think that Defence of Truth, or of that which one is convinced to be such, is alwaies the Sin of not enduring to be told of faults: Neither do I by so saying *referr the determining of our Debates to mens Fancies*, which he hinteth, p. 47. that we call the *Dictates of Conscience* (I am sorry that he doth either so undervalue Conscience, or reflect on the worthy Persons that answered his Sermon.) If we cannot shew plain and evident *Reasons* for what we say, (as he requireth) we refuse not *causa cadere*.

Sect. 31. He telleth a very formal Story, p. 51, 52. of the Effects of his Sermon, of the mimick Gestures of the *Non-conformists*, when it was spoken of; the Truth of which History, tho' I doubt, I cannot disprove. It neither was worth his writing, nor my confuting. He thinketh *it lay at bottom of many mens Stomachs, that he did not perswade the Church of* England *to the Dissenters*. Who did ever require that? We pretend to no Authority over Her; if she would have condescended to us for Peace sake (which that Party talk so much of) to forbear imposing her unnecessary things, which we judge unlawful, that should have satisfied us. But he thinks (p. 53.) *it had been unseasonable to speak of Alteration of Laws before Magistrates, who are tied to the Laws; that such Alteration is one of the weightiest things*. Ans. *Supposing* (as he there saith) *his private Opinion for Abatements*, there was no need of proposing the Alteration

of

of Eſtabliſhed Laws; but the expoſing of them that were under the laſh of Inconvenient Laws, may well be forborn, before the Executors of theſe Laws, by a man that thinketh that Abatement ſhould be made of the rigour of theſe Laws; I do not think (as he doth) that *the alteration of every Eſtabliſhed Law is a Matter of ſuch weight as any thing that can be taken into conſideration*, provided the conſideration about it be by ſuch as have Power to alter it: What is more common than altering of Laws when they are found inconvenient? Our firſt Reformers thought not ſo under *Edward* 6. The *Liturgy* (and the Law for it) was altered when excepted againſt by Mr. *Calvin* abroad, and ſome Zealots (ſo the Hiſtorian ſpeaks) at home, *Full. Chur. Hiſt.* 6, 7. p. 386. Why may not this be done now, when Diſſatisfaction is become more univerſal? But it is a ſuppoſition that I can give no account of, that the Laws againſt *Non-conformity* (for of theſe his Diſcourſe muſt be underſtood, if it be at all to the purpoſe) ſhould be ſo looked on, as that they concern the *preſervation of the Church and Religion*: That Church and Religion muſt ſtand on a tottering Foundation, that cannot be preſerved, if thoſe things be laid aſide which are acknowledged to be indifferent. But thus it is to dote on *Mens Inventions*; it is ordinary to equal, if not preferr them, to *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, *Mark* 7. 13. *Mat.* 15. 6. *Qui amat ranam, ranam putat eſſe Dianam.*

Sect. 32. But the Dr. is not content, not to adviſe the altering of theſe Laws, where it had not been very pertinent to propoſe it, but he bringeth Reaſons able (as he thinketh) to preponderate all the Conſiderations that any might uſe for changing them; theſe Reaſons are in number Six; the 1. is, *The Impoſſibility of ſatisfying all Diſſenters*. Muſt therefore none be ſatisfied, becauſe all cannot? Some will be ſatisfied, if you will but forbear impoſing what God hath not commanded: Others will not be ſatisfied, unleſs you forbear alſo ſome of *Chriſt's Inſtitutions*, ſuch as *Infant Baptiſm*; is it reaſon to neglect the doing the one of theſe for Peace and Unity, becauſe you cannot do the other? The 2. is, *The Uncertainty of gaining any conſiderable number by Relaxations*. If any man look on this as uncertain, it muſt be either becauſe he knoweth not what we ſcruple at, or becauſe he thinketh us reſolved to diſſent without reaſon, when the reaſon of our Diſſent is removed; but, I hope the Dr. is neither ſo ignorant, nor ſo uncharitable: He may be well aſſured, that by relaxing the *Impoſition* of humane Ceremonies, all the Presbyterians ſhall be gained to join in worſhipping of God with

with the *preſent Church*; and I hope he will not ſay, that they are no conſiderable number in *England*. His 3. Reaſon is, *The difficulty of keeping Factions out of the Church, conſidering the ungovernableneſs of ſome mens Tempers and Principles. Anſw.* If the Diſcipline that *Chriſt* hath inſtituted be duly exerciſed in the *Church*, that will either make men governable, yea, actually govern them; or it will exclude them out of the *Church*, and ſo Factions ſhall ceaſe in the *Church*: But it is a ſtrange piece of *Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, on ſuppoſition that ſome will prove *ungovernable*, to obtain the making of Civil Laws for impoſing thoſe things on mens Conſciences, which the Impoſers count *need nots*, and they on whom they are impoſed, know them to be unlawful. This is the way to make them ungovernable (in reference to theſe particular *Impoſitions*) who would tamely ſubmit to any Yoke that is not contrary to that of *Chriſt*. But it ſeems the Dr. looketh on all that ſcruple at human Ceremonies as ungovernable Perſons: And we rationally think, that his Party are reſolved, that we ſhall either be governed by their Will, (not by the Word of God) or they will take the moſt effectual ways that they can to keep us out of their *Church*. I confeſs, *Conſcience* is an *ungovernable* thing, except by the Laws of *Chriſt*; but it is much the Strain of ſome of his Party, (I am confident the Reverend Dr. doth not mean ſo ill) to ridicule and cry down Conſcience in private perſons, that they may be *governed* by the *publick Conſcience*, (a *Solœciſm* in Divinity, never heard of before) *i. e. The Will of the Superiours*; the thing, to wit, *Blind Obedience*, is an old *Popiſh* Tool, to enſlave *Conſciences*; but ſuch an expreſs affronting of Conſcience, (God's Deputy in the Soul) is a new Invention that this Age is honoured with.

Sect. 33. His 4. Reaſon is, *The danger of breaking all in pieces by a Toleration.* Anſ. *Toleration* is both commanded in Scripture, *Rom.* 14. 1. *Eph.* 4. 2, 3. In this laſt place it is joined with endeavouring after Unity, ſo far is it from being the way to break all in pieces, as the Dr. thinketh. It is alſo condemned, *Rev.* 2. 2, 20. wherefore it ſhould not have been ſo generally cenſured, as a *Church-ruining thing*. Beſide, *Toleration* is not that which we plead for in the firſt place, but that the things that grieve our Conſciences may be removed, that ſo we may join with you in worſhipping God in his own way, that we may need no *Toleration*; but if that cannot be obtained, our next deſire is, that we may be ſuffered to worſhip God in that way that is acceptable to him by our ſelves, when we cannot do it

with you; neither is it a *vaſt and univerſal Toleration of all Blaſphemies, Hereſies, and Unpeaceableneſs*, that we contend for, but a forbearing of ſuch as live peaceable in their Diſſent from you in the ſmaller Concerns of Religion. This *Toleration* would break nothing in pieces, but the denying of it tendeth to break all in pieces: For while Men have the uſe of their *Conſcience*, they will *Diſſent*, and ſerve God in the way that they apprehend pleaſeth him, without mens leave, when they cannot do it with their leave. It is a great miſtake to think that Unity among Chriſtians lieth only or mainly in *Uniformity*, and not rather in *Conſent*, in the main points of Religion, and loving *forbearance* in reference to the reſt.

Sect. 34. The 5. is, *The expoſing our ſelves to the Papiſts and others, by receding too far from the firſt principles and frame of our Reformation.* This is plain enough; yet without wronging the ſcope or ſence, it might have been thus expreſſed more openly, *We are aſhamed to mend, leſt Men ſhould think that we once were wrong.* This Reaſon, if it prove any thing, will conclude againſt all *Reformations*: Might it not have been pleaded againſt the aboliſhing the high places in *Solomon*'s, *Azariah*'s, and *Joſiah*'s time; (of which before?) This will expoſe us to *Baal*-Worſhippers, as too far receding from the firſt Principles of our Reformation: Might not the ſame have been in K. *Edward* 6's time, and in Q. *Elizabeth*'s time, in the one of which ſomewhat was mended that was defective in the Reformation by *Hen.* 8. And in the other *Praying for the Dead*, and ſome other things were laid aſide, that had been under *Edw.* 6. It is beyond my capacity to underſtand how this could expoſe you to the Papiſts or any other; what could they ſay, but that ſome of their *Superſtitions* were at firſt over-lookt, which now you ſee the Evil of, and think fit to remove them? What advantage could they make of all this againſt the Church of *England*? It will be hard to convince thoſe of miſtake, who think, that cleaving to theſe Ceremonies doth more *expoſe the Church* to the *Papiſts*, and give them hope of their thinking at laſt of returning to them, when they ſee how loath they are to go too far from them. This Principle ſeemeth to make what we have done, or the *firſt Frame of the Reformation*, the Rule of the *Reformation*, rather than the Word of God: Neither can the laying aſide of humane Ceremonies be rationally eſteemed a receding very far from the *Frame and firſt Principles of the Reformation*, ſeeing they are of ſo inconſiderable moment, and next to nothing, compared with the weighty points of Truth that we gained by the

Re-

Reformation. It is known to them, who have lookt into the Hiſtory of the *Council of Trent*, that this very principle put an effectual Bar to all *Reformation* in the Papacy, that was ſo much deſired, and ſtickled for by ſome. His *ſixth* Reaſon is, *The difficulty of keeping out prieſts*, pretending to be allowed Diſſenters: This reaſon is near of Kin to that which *papiſts* uſe againſt Peoples reading Scripture; The difficulty of keeping men from catching *Hereſy* by it: If the Dr. here ſuppoſe the Diſſenters to be well affected to the Prieſts, and willing to have their Company; or ſo unskilful, that they cannot diſcern a Prieſt's Droctrine, from that of a *Proteſtant*; or to admit Miniſters among them, to the Diſcharge of that office, without Trial, and Teſtimonials: Or, if he ſuppoſe, that when men are allowed, by Law, to Worſhip God without Ceremonies; that the Law is ſo laid aſleep, that men may do what they liſt: If, I ſay, all theſe things be ſuppoſed, this Reaſon may ſeem to have ſome weight, but without ſuch a ſuppoſition, it is lighter than Chaff, and unworthy of the Pen of the learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

Sect. 35. I perceive the Dr. cannot get that fancy out of his Head, That *the ſtrength and union of the National Settlement dependeth on continuing of the preſent Impoſitions, and that they are neceſſary to keep out Popery.* Enough hath been already ſaid, to lay open the fondneſs of this Imagination, and its inconſiſtency with what Sentiments about the *Ceremonies* themſelves do on other occaſions declare, when it ſerveth a turn. After ſome indecent contempt of Mr. *A.* in reference to what he had ſaid of the Dr's *Sermon*, he diſtinguiſheth (p. 55.) between *Lay-Communion* and *Miniſterial Conformity*, that he meddleth with the former, not the latter, his reaſon is, If the People thought themſelves bound to do what is their Duty towards Communion with the *Church*, many Miniſters would change their Mind. I contract, but not miſrepreſent what he ſaith. To this I return two things, 1. Why *Miniſterial Conformity* ſhould not be taken into conſideration in ſuch a Diſcourſe, is not eaſily underſtood: But that we may ſee the Dr. hath a mind not only to make a diſtinction but a difference between *Non-conformiſt* Miniſters and their People, according to the Maxime, *Divide & impera.* If all the People might lawfully conform, and the Miniſters alſo could ſubmit to what he calleth *Lay-Communion*, is no regard to be had to the many *Hundreds* (not to ſay *Thouſands*) of Miniſters, many of them *Eminent*, and moſt, if not all of them, *compleatly fitted* for the Work of the Goſpel, and who have God's and His *Church*'s Call to that

Work? Is there no Conſideration to be uſed by the *Church*, how the Labours of all theſe may not be loſt, while the Harveſt is great, and the Labourers few? (unleſs it be thought, that the Caſe is not ſo now) and, Shall they all be rendered uſeleſs, rather than the impoſing of Subſcription and Aſſent to what is confeſſedly not inſtituted before born? Doth this ſavour of that Regard to Souls, and of that love of Peace and Unity that our Brethren make ſuch a noiſe with, when it ſuiteth their purpoſe? Tho' they think us no *Miniſters* for want of *Epiſcopal Ordination*, yet we cannot think ſo of our ſelves; and that one Principle ſheweth them the greateſt *Schiſmaticks* that are among *Proteſtants*; for by it they unchurch moſt, if not all the *Reformed Churches*, and unminiſter all their Paſtours and nullifie *Baptiſm* and all the other Ordinances that are among them.

Sect. 36. The other thing that I reply to this diſtinction of the Dr's is, That we have ſuch rational and well-grounded Scruples even againſt *Lay-Communion*, that is, joining in their *Service*, and the uſe of the *Ceremonies*, that nothing that we yet have ſeen, is able to remove, as I hope the Progreſs of this *Debate* ſhall make appear. He alledgeth, (p. 6.) that *The ſcruple of the Surplice is worn out, kneeling at the Sacrament is generally allowed by the more moderate Non-conformiſts: For the ſign of the Croſs*, Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, *The ſin (if it be one) in uſing it, is not the Perſons who bring the Child to be baptized, but the Miniſters*; and that he alſo debateth for the uſe of the *Liturgy*. To all this I anſwer, We have the ſame Scruple againſt the *Surplice* we had of old, but do not for it withdraw, it being the Miniſter's fault, not Ours. For *Kneeling*, it is our own act, and therefore we muſt either be diſpenſed with in it (which the Church will not do) or forbear the Sacrament in which it is; for we utterly deny, that the more Judicious of the *Non-conformiſts* do allow it; neither do I ſee how they can, and diſallow other Ceremonies; for they all ſtand on one bottom (to wit) that they are not inſtituted: but more of this in its due place. For *Mr. Baxter*'s Authority we lay little weight on it; he hath his own Singular Opinions which neither party do unanimouſly allow. His Reaſons in their place we ſhall Conſider. What he ſaith of the *Croſſing* the Baptized Party, I know not that I ſhall hereafter be put in mind of it, wherefore I anſwer, That tho' it be the Miniſters Action, yet it is the Parties (or his Repreſentatives) paſſion; and that Perſonal. It cannot be done on my Perſon, or my Child's without my Conſent and Submiſſion; as if

I willingly ſuffer Holy Water to be ſprinkled on me, I am culpable in reference to that *Superſtition*: So it is in this caſe.

Sect. 37. The heavy Complaint that he maketh, *Pag.* 58. of the unmanly and barbarous uſage that he met with for his *Sermon*, I am wholly a ſtranger to, and can paſs no Judgment on it; but if this be as he ſaith, it is no way to be juſtified. But he ſhould not charge the party with this: There are ſome Scurrilous and Mean wits among all Parties of men, who have no other way to expreſs their Zeal againſt what they diſlike: And if we ſhould trouble the world with ſuch publick Reſentments of the ſame kind of dealings, and worſe, that we and our way have met with, and Daily do meet with, not only from the Rabble and drunken boozers of his party; but from Pulpits and the Preſs, not by the baſer Phamphelteers only, but famous Authors (witneſs Dr. *Heylin's Hiſtory of Presbytery*) we might write Books abundance. His citation of *Biſhop Whitgift* cometh little ſhort of a full proof of what I now ſay, in that he repreſenteth us as *Depravers, Railers, Back-biters, Inventors of Lyes, and ſpreaders of falſe Rumors; and that of the beſt deſerving men, if they but come ſhort of pleaſing our humour.*

Sect. 38. The Dr. next, *p.* 59. taketh a view of the forces that he ſaith were muſtered up againſt his *Sermon*, and paſſeth a Verdict on each of his Adverſaries, which I ſhall not ſtay to Conſider. Only I think he Treateth *Mr. B.* with too much of the ſame ſharpneſs, that he complaineth he hath received: Tho' I think none who knoweth the writings of that learned man, will applaud his ſevere ſtrain. And for *Mr. A.* whether the Dr. was piqued by ſome home Thurſts that he had met with from him, I know not; but a man of his Worth and Learning ſhould not have been ſo diſpiſed, and his VVriting Repreſented ſo Contemptibly as the *Dr.* dealeth with him; the facetiouſneſs of his ſtrain needed to have bred no ſuch Diſguſt; it is neither ſo Low nor Scurrilous as the Author would make us believe; others look on it as a condiment to prevent *Tædium* and nauſeouſneſs. I know none that blameth the excellent Writings of *Mr. Fuller*, which have a pleaſantneſs not unlike that of *Mr. A's*. The debate that next falleth in between the Dr. and *Mr. A.* about the true meaning of the Text, of the *Dr's. Sermon*, he now waveth; as I ſhall alſo do that about the proof of a Deity, which I think might have paſſed, as Forreign to this purpoſe.

Sect. 39. One of his Antagoniſts (*p.* 71.) chargeth him with changableneſs, in writing here contrary to what he had written in his

his *Irenicum*, about which he maketh Diverſe Apologies. A change in this Learned Man is too viſible, and if it had been to the better, it had not been Culpable; but becauſe his Changes do not ſo much concern our preſent debate about *Conformity* to the preſent *Church*-way, I ſhall not meddle in that matter at this time: Eſpecially a change being (upon the matter) acknowledged by himſelf, *p.* 76. One thing I cannot paſs over; That he had Aſſerted in his *Irenicum*, *that if others caſt them wholly out of Communion, then is their Separation neceſſary*: which he would reconcile with what he here writeth, *p.* 47. by ſhewing a difference as to this between the *Excommunication* of the *Church of Rome*, and of the *Church of England*: for ſaith he, *Our Church doth not caſt one wholly out of Communion for meer Scrupulous Non-conformity, but alloweth to Communicate in ſome parts of worſhip.* 2. *Ours is but the leſſer Excommunication*; which he confeſſeth, *publick defamers of the Orders of the Church to be under, ipſo facto, by the Canons*; *but that it layeth on no Obligation till duely Executed*: *But the Excommunication of* Rome *is with an anathema.* All this is very little to the preſent purpoſe: for if we be all, *ipſo facto*, *Excommunicated*, and if this *Excommunication* be moſt frequently (as it is) *Executed* againſt us, and *capias*'s iſſued out commonly againſt us; and all this for meer Scrupulous Non-conformity (as he calleth it) by theſe means we are *de facto*, put in ſuch a Caſe, as we cannot enjoy all the Ordinances of God among them; and therefore we muſt either live without Gods Ordinances; or have them out of Communion with their *Church*. Again, he Alledgeth *p.* 75. that *he could not mean, that there was an equal reaſon in theſe caſes, when he expreſly determineth, That, in the caſe of our Church, men are bound in conſcience to ſubmit to the orders of it*: Neither doth this help the Matter; for if we think (as we do) that we are bound, in Conſcience, not to ſubmit to all the Orders of the *Church*, ſome of them being unwarranted by the Word of God; and if for this Opinion, and ſuitable Practice to it, we be ſo *excommunicated*, as we cannot enjoy God's Ordinances with the *Church*; then we are caſt wholly out of the *Church*, and our *Separation* muſt be Lawful, on the ground that of old he had laid down. But *pag.* 76. *He would, in that caſe, allow us a ſcrupulous forbearance of Acts of Communion*; *but not to proceed to a poſitive Separation.* But if we make uſe of his Allowance, the *Church*, who is of another mind, putteth a Bar to our Enjoying all God's Ordinances: What can we then do, but either live without them, or proceed to that, which he is pleaſed to call a *poſitive Separation?*

ration? We are not convinced, that our Practice is condemned by the wiſer *Proteſtants* abroad, for all the Letters that he mentioneth; of which, in their place: And it is a raſh Aſſertion (which he knoweth cannot be Tried) *pag.* 77. *That if a Council were called of all the Proteſtant Churches in* Chriſtendom; *we ſhould not doubt of their Determination, of the unlawfulneſs of the preſent Separation.* He, our Author, maketh good the ſaying, *Quod miſere volumus, id facile credimus*; any man that hath ſeen the *Uniformity*, in almoſt all things, that is between our mode of Worſhip and their's; and the great Deformity that is between theirs and that of the *Church of England*, will find reaſon to expect a quite contrary Determination from ſuch an Aſſembly. We may appeal in this caſe even to ſome of the Sons of the *Church of England*. The excellent and Pious, and Learned *Sr. Matthew Hales*, in his Book of *Schiſm*, hath this paſſage. *In times of manifeſt Corruptions and Perſecutions, where Religious Aſſembling is dangerous, private meetings, howſoever beſide publick Order, are not only Lawful, but they are of neceſſity and Duty. All pious Aſſemblies in times of perſecution and Corruption, however practiſed, are indeed, or rather alone, the Lawful congregations and publick Aſſemblies, though according to form of Law, are indeed nothing but Riots and Conventicles, if they be ſtained with Corruption and Superſtition.*

Sect. 40. He anſwereth an Objection, pag. 77. That *the Publiſhing of this Book is now unſeaſonable, being a hindrance to the Union of Proteſtants, to which there ſeemeth now to be a general Inclination.* He Alledgeth (p. 78.) that *the principles of Non-conformiſts hinder that Union, and lay a foundation for perpetual Diviſions.* He knoweth that we will not own this, and therefore proveth it (as he thinketh) *On the principles laid down by ſome of the Diſſenting Brethren; Let the conſtitution be never ſo eaſie to themſelves, others may make uſe of their grounds, and carry on the Difference as high as ever.* I wiſh he had told us what theſe grounds are. But it is an Odd kind of Reaſoning; we will not endeavour Union with them who may be *Tolerated*, becauſe they who are not to be *Tolerated*, will expect the ſame favour. The ground on which we plead for forbearance, is, our Scruple about what you confeſs to be no Inſtitution of Chriſt nor neceſſary duty; we in our Conſcience judge it unlawful, and can ſhew good reaſon for our ſo judging: How this ground can be Improved by any body to heighten Differences, unleſs it be by the peremptorineſs of them that will Impoſe ſuch Things, I do not underſtand.

derſtand. He profeſſeth to *be for Union that will leſſen differences, and not weaken*, but ſtrengthen the Proteſtant Religion: Now let any judge whether the Union that is founded on the ground propoſed be not ſuch.

Sect. 41. He ſaith, p. 97. That *Univerſal Liberty differeth from Union, as looſing from binding; and it is ſtrange, if that which Papiſts lately thought the beſt Means to bring in Popery, ſhould now be lookt on as the moſt effectual way to keep it out.* *Anſ.* We do not, nor ever did plead for *Univerſal Liberty*, which was that which no doubt *Papiſts* aimed at, *ergo nihil dictum.* *But ſuppoſe*, ſaith he, *the Indulgence be at preſent ſtrictly limitted to Diſſenting Proteſtants, we are not ſure it will always continue ſo; Will not the ſame Reaſons, as to Scruple of Conſcience, Suffering for Religion*, &c. *be extended further when occaſion ſerveth, and Popery getteth footing on the Diſſenters Grounds?* *Anſ.* Were it not as rational for us to ſay, Tho' we can now join with the *Church of England*, in her preſent Ceremonies, what know we how ſoon on the ſame grounds ſhe may bring in all thoſe of *Popery?* Let us forbear evil ſurmiſing, and mind our preſent Duty, eſpecially ſeeing the way to prevent this feared Evil is obvious, (to wit) that no *Indulgence* be granted after, but what there is as good Reaſon for, and as little hazard from, as is at preſent: Neither do we plead for *Indulgence* meerly on the grounds of *Scruple of Conſcience*, or *Suffering for Religion*; but on other grounds in conjunction with theſe, as hath been a little above expreſſed. It is like our Grounds may be comprehended in his wide-Bellied, *&c.* but if by it he means all grounds of Forbearance now may be extended to plead for an *undue Toleration*, then all Forbearance of *Chriſtians* that diſſent in any thing, muſt be unlawful, which is contrary to the Scripture formerly mentioned, and to the general Sentiments of all Chriſtians, except Papiſts, whoſe Religion ſtandeth by Blood and Cruelty.

Sect. 42. *Where* (ſaith he) *hath the Church of* Rome *more Labourers and a greater Harveſt than under the greateſt Liberty of Conſcience?* Witneſs the ſtate of the *Northern* Kingdoms, compared with the number of *Papiſts* in the *united Netherlands*; I can ſoon tell him where, (to wit) under *Epiſcopal Perſecution of Proteſtants in* Britain. If this be a miſtake, theſe Nations have been for ſome Years in a Dream. Again, his Inſtance is wide from the purpoſe, for we plead not for a *Toleration* of all ſects, and particularly not of Papiſts; what *Toleration* is in the *Netherlands*, themſelves can beſt give account of. He aſſerteth it impoſſible to keep out *Popery*, where

To-

Toleration is allowed; and I aſſert it as impoſſible to keep in *Chriſtianity* in an impure *Church*, where it is not allowed; and yet there is no inconſiſtency between the two Aſſertions, if we diſtinguiſh between a *Limited Toleration*, which we plead for, and one *Unlimited*, which he all along ſpeaketh of. To talk of *Toleration* thus without diſtinction, is to walk in the Clouds, and not deſcend to the thing in debate, which is unbeſeeming a Diſputant.

Sect. 43. He bringeth Three Arguments, p. 79, 80. to prove his Aſſertion; 1. *Becauſe of the various waies of creeping in under ſeveral Diſguiſes, which the Prieſts and Jeſuits have, and can never be prevented, where there is a general Indulgence for Diſſenters, and an unaccountable Church-power is allowed to ſeparate Congregations.*

Anſ. 1. This Argument *Supponit falſum*, which we have often diſclaimed; to wit, That we plead for a general Indulgence to Diſſenters; we deſire it may be limitted to men of peaceable Principles and Practices; to ſuch as differ from the publick way in matters not Fundamental nor near to the Foundation (and for our part, who are Presbyterians, we ſeek forbearance only in things that are acknowledged to be none of *Chriſt's Inſtitutions*,) and in things that are neither againſt Godlineſs, nor the Peace of Church or State. Another Falſhood that he ſuppoſeth, is, That we plead for *an unaccountable Church-power in Separate Meetings*. We plead for no Power in them, but what a good account can be given of from Scripture; and what is allowed commonly to a Church as ſuch. 2. I mention'd before a way of preventing the creeping in of *Prieſts* and *Jeſuits*, for all their Cunning, (to wit) The due Exerciſe of Church-Diſcipline, in all the ways that ſhall be tolerated, eſpecially in the admiſſion of Miniſters to their Office; and if theſe Foxes creep in at undiſcerned cranies, if Diſcipline be in vigour, they may be caſt out again, before they can do any conſiderable harm to the Flock.

Sect. 44. Argument 2. *Becauſe it will be great hardſhip, when mens heats are over, for them* (the Papiſts) *only to be deprived of the Liberty of their Conſciences, when the wildeſt of Phanaticks are allowed it.*

Anſw. 1. Still the old Suppoſition muſt found all his Arguments. We plead for no *Toleration* to any *Phanaticks* (properly ſo called) much leſs to the wildeſt of them. 2. There are many weighty Reaſons why *Papiſts* ſhould be denied that Liberty that is allowed to *Proteſtant Diſſenters*; from the Groſſneſs of their Hereſies, the Idolatry of their Worſhip, the Unpeaceableneſs of their Principles,

ſuch as dethroning Kings, and cutting off all people that are Hereticks in their Sence; their Principle of bearing down all Religion but their own. Had a *Non-conformiſt* ſpoke as much on the behalf of Papiſts, what a noiſe would our Author have made about it, that *we do their Work, &c.* His 3. Argument is, *Becauſe the diverſity of Sects that will be kept up by this means, will be alwaies thought a plauſible Argument to draw men to the Popiſh Pretences of Unity. Anſ.* By whom will this be thought? Surely, by no man that conſidereth, 1. That Unity in *Error* and *Idolatry* is no perſwading Argument to them who regard the Truths of God. 2. That our Differences are in things of the ſmalleſt moment in Religion, and managed with Chriſtian Love and Meekneſs, (for who exceed theſe Bounds, may be puniſhed by the Laws, notwithſtanding a Toleration granted.) 3. That the *Popiſh* Unity is but pretended, there being more and weightier Differences among them, than among us; as the Dr. well knoweth, and hath, by his learned Labours, made the World know. His 4. Argument is, *Becauſe the allowed Sects will in probability grow more inſolent upon a legal Indulgence, and bid defiance to the Setled Conſtitution, as we have ſeen already by the yet viſible Effects of the former Indulgence. Anſ.* 1. He hath little Charity for his Brethren, in expecting ſuch things from them, and leſs in making ſuch an Obſerve on what is paſt, without any ground known to unbyaſſed men. If he mean of any Indecency in Speech or Behaviour among the vulgar, we cannot anſwer for that; there is too much of it on both hands: Neither is it fit, that on ſuch a frivolous Ground the Sober and Conſcientious ſhould be perſecuted. 2. If Inſolency ſhall happen (as God forbid) to be the conſequent of *Liberty to Diſſenters*, let the Guilty be puniſhed by the Law. We plead for *Toleration* to Mens *Conſciences*, not to their *Immoralities*; but, *Are we to expect, that the Laws of Men ſhould work more upon them than the Grace of God? Anſ.* Not on their Minds and Wills to change them, but on the outward Man to reſtrain them. Such an Effect may be rationally expected, and is daily obſerved in other Caſes. It is an odious Repreſentation, as if *the Uſe of the Liberty pleaded for were only to preach and pray, & write & diſpute againſt one another*; and as abſurd an Inference, that *there ſeemeth to be much of Sence and Reaſon in the Papal Pretence to Unity and Infallibility.* Whatever our Author, or the by-ſtanders that he mentioneth may think, they who have a juſt Abhorrence of Popery, will think, that none of the *Diviſions* that are amongſt us, are ſo bad as it by far, tho' we deſire

nei-

neither to excuſe nor extenuate them: Nor do we refuſe to concur in our Station in any good way to heal theſe *Diſtempers*.

Sect. 45. The reſt of the Dr's Preface is taken up in expreſſing his *condeſcendency* to the *Diſſenters*, in the things that they ſcruple, tho' he pleadeth for the *Ceremonies* as Lawful, (which is afterward to be debated) yet he would have a Liberty allowed, that they who ſcruple them, may have the Ordinances without them. If this were put in practice, it would be one ſtep toward healing: But it ſeems the Church-men are not of his mind: However, we do thankfully own his *moderation*. His other Condeſcendencies to ſuch as ſcruple Joining in the uſe of the *Liturgy*, are for the moſt part very commendable, and might make *England* Happy, if they were practiſed. But till ſome appearance of that be, it will be needleſs for us to tell our Sence of them in particular: But his kindneſs to his Brethren of the Miniſtry doth not ſo well appear by his Diſcourſe from *p.*88. He is willing to gain the People, but ſeemeth to look on the Miniſters as Competitors; his Reaſons for dealing ſo with them it were not hard to anſwer; but conſidering, that there is little hope of ſeeing even what he holdeth to be made practicable, I think it needleſs to contend about it; only I muſt tell him, that tho' we be as far as he is againſt *Lay-men*, (as he ſpeaketh) or any unordained Perſon, uſurping the Office, or doing the Work of a Miniſter, yet his Propoſals are very lame, as to affording any Miniſters at all. And then what do all his commendable yieldings, as to the People, ſignifie? Would he have them have Separate Meetings, but no Miniſters in them to Adminiſter the Ordinances of God to them? This is a ſort of *Toleration* that would neither be for our Advantage, nor the Credit of the Church that alloweth it: So that in a great many Pages he hath ſaid nothing.

There is nothing further to be noted in the Preface; for we wiſh the Propoſals that he maketh, for Reforming ſome Abuſes in the *Church*, p. 93. might take effect.

Having now got through the *Preface*, I proceed to the *Book*, which the Learned Author divideth into Three Parts; the 1. is, An Hiſtorical Account of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Separation. The 2. is, Of the nature of the Separation. The 3. is, Of the Pleas for the Separtion. I ſhall accordingly divide this Examination, and follow him, Κατὰ πόδας, ſo far as the clearing of our Principles and Practice does require it. The Name of *Separation* is juſtly odi-

ous in the Church; and it is certain, that where ever it is, ſome great Blame lieth on the one Party or the other, and ſometimes on both; but there often is a ſad and undeſirable *Separation*, attended with bad Conſequences, where yet the one Party is wholly innocent. I ſhould here ſpeak ſomewhat to open the nature of that Separation that the Learned Dr. chargeth us with, but that were to anticipate what is to be diſcourſed, animadverting on the Second part of his Book, and therefore I now wave it.

PART I.

The Dr's *Hiſtorical Account of the Separation, Examined and Anſwered.*

IN his Sect. 1. he premiſeth two things, in proſecuting which, his Firſt Part of his Book is taken up. The firſt is, That although the preſent Reaſons for Separation would have held from the beginning of our Reformation, yet no ſuch thing was then practiſed or allowed, by thoſe who were then moſt zealous for Reformation.

SECT. I.

The Practice of the Firſt Non-conformiſts conſidered.

BEfore we conſider his 2*d*. Propoſition, let us try how this will abide the Teſt. Here are two Aſſertions put together, which for the greater clearneſs I ſhall conſider apart; the one is *Doctrinal*, the other *Hiſtorical*: The *Doctrinal* part of his Propoſition, is, That *the preſent Reaſons for Separation* (I ſhall not contend about calling our practice ſo, not being willing to contend about words) *would have held from the beginning of the Reformation.*

This I deny, and ſhall firſt give the Reaſon of my denial, and then try the ſtrength of what he ſaith for his Aſſertion. The Reaſon that I bring, is, That our Reformation was carried on by degrees; as *Rome was not built in a day*, ſo neither was it pulled down among us in a day. King *Hen.* 8. began this Work, but did it ſo lame-

lamely, that *Proteſtants* were little ſatisfied. There wanted not *Non-conformiſts* then, who were all the true *Proteſtants*; many of them laid down their Lives for their *Non-conformity*. After him, his Son *Edw. 6.* a religious and zealous Prince, reformed many things, but not all at once; for the *Liturgy* was twice Reformed in his Reign, *Full. Ch. Hiſt.* book 7. p. 386. once in his Firſt Year, and again in a Parliament held in his 5, & 6. Years; and again, in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*; there were alſo ſome Alterations made in the *Rubrick*, 1 *Jacob.* 1603. ſaith the ſame Author. And it is known, that ſeveral things unreformed in *Edw.* 6's Reign, were after taken away; as may be ſeen by comparing his *Injunctions* with what afterward was practiſed in them. We have mention of *Coming to Confeſſion in Lent*, *Art.* 9. of *High Maſs*, *Art.* 21. *Prayer for the Dead* is expreſly injoined in the form of bidding of Common Prayers; all which were afterward removed, name and thing; yea, theſe very *Injunctions* gave people Hope of a further Reformation; for they were only intended till a Parliament ſhould be called. And *Art.* 27. People are injoined, *not to violate the Ceremonies not as yet abrogated*; which gave the people confidence, that ſuch *Superſtitions* were not to be continued as a Burden to Mens Conſciences, but were uſed for the preſent ſuppoſed neceſſity.

Sect. 2. The Caſe is far otherwiſe with us; we are put beyond all Hope of Relief; a Yoke of *Humane Ceremonies* wreathed on our Neck, without any probability of being looſed from it: For after the King's happy Reſtauration, then there was the faireſt opportunity that could be wiſhed for Condeſcendence and Accommodation, the Ceremonies having gone into Diſuetude for 20 years, and the Nation being more generally againſt them than ever before, by the Light of the Word, that had for ſo many years been more freely and fully held forth than before; and when a great number of Miniſters preſented a *Petition for Peace*, to their Brethren then commiſſionate to Reform the *Liturgy*, and uſed the ſtrongeſt Reaſons, the moſt earneſt Obteſtations, and the greateſt Condeſcentions that could be, to obtain either a taking away of what was grievous to their Conſciences, or, at leaſt, a forbearance in them, (all which may be ſeen at length in the Book it ſelf;) yet nothing was to be obtained, but *Impoſitions* made more ſtrict, and our Yoke made heavier than before, rather than lighter; ſo that there remained no more Hope for our ſelves, or our Poſterity; but either we and they muſt take up with a Worſhip, that, we are convinced, is mixt with

ſome

ſome things that maketh it diſpleaſing to God, or live without God's Ordinances, or worſhip God apart by our ſelves. May not we appeal to God, and to all the World, That whatever our Brethren talk of *Peace* and *Unity*, *we were for Peace, but when we ſpake, they were for Wars?* Pſal. 120. 6. while they will not abate nor bear with us in one Ceremony, (which themſelves declare *Indifferent*) for that *Peace* and *Unity* that they extol ſo highly; yea, for the keeping out of *Popery*, the re-entry of which they pretend to fear by our *Diviſions*.

Sect. 3. Theſe things being conſidered, it is very evident, That our Caſe is not parallel with that of the firſt *Non-conformiſts*, in reference to Communion with the Church, and therefore the Reaſons that moved them to go along with the preſent way, do not conclude, that we ought to do the ſame; for, 1. There was then a neceſſity apprehended by ſome of the beſt men for retaining ſome of the *Ceremonies* that had been in uſe in *Popery*, leſt too ſudden and viſible a Change (it being the out-ſide of Religion that the multitude doth moſt conſider) ſhould have ſcared the people from owning the *Reformation*; and we know, *Neceſſitas quicquid coegit defendit*: On this Ground even the Apoſtles retained for a time a little of the *Jewiſh* Obſervations, *Act.* 15. 28, 29. I do not ſay, that there was a neceſſity for this, but it was then thought to be, and therefore muſt needs influence their minds and practice, as if there really had been ſuch a neceſſity: But now it is evident to unbyaſſed men, that there is no ſuch neceſſity for retaining theſe Ceremonies. *Papiſts* are ſo far from being brought over to us by ſymbolizing with them, that they conceive Hope, from that very thing, of our returning to them; as hath been made appear by ſeveral paſſages in their Writings and Diſcourſes, which I now ſtay not to rehearſe: And in very deed, our *Service*, eſpecially in Cathedrals, cometh ſo much nearer to their way, than it doth either to the way of the Apoſtolick Church (ſo far as it is recorded in Scripture) or to the way of moſt of the Reformed Churches; that it were no hard task to bring in *Popiſh* Worſhip (abating the *Service* being in *Latin*) and Diſcipline (or in that alſo we are at no great diſtance from *Popery*) among us, without being obſerved by the Vulgar. And the neceſſity is yet the leſs for retaining them among us, that our People have not been bred in *Popery*, as in thoſe Times, when the Ceremonies were retained, and therefore are not in that hazard that they were to fall back into *Popery* upon the aboliſhing of them; yea, it is ſo far from

from that, that the diſuſe of theſe might make Popery to be more forgotten among the people, theſe being ſome of the Ornaments by which that whoriſh Worſhip was once decked.

Sect. 4. A Second Ground, why the reaſon of their cleaving to the *Church-way* doth not conclude for our doing the like, is, They had cauſe to look on their Grievances but as temporary, and knew that further *Reformation* was deſigned, and might be in a ſhort time expected, and therefore it was Reaſon that they ſhould rather forbear, for that time, their Edification, (I mean the external means of it) that they might have had by pure Ordinances, rather than ſeem to make a Breach. This Reaſon doth not at all touch us, who are out of all hope of ſuch purity of Ordinances in the Church, as is pleaſing to God, or conſiſtent with His Acceptance; (I mean, from us, who know the right way; for I ſhall not judge what acceptance an impure worſhip, invincibly not known to be ſuch, may find with God) they had not in vain eſſayed to make Peace with their Brethren, and been rejected with a peremptory cleaving to the leaſt *Indifferent Ceremony*, rather than to ſatisfie the *Conſcientious Scruples* of thoſe who doubted; which is our Caſe. Therefore we are (even by them who blame us for what they force us to) brought to a neceſſity of worſhipping God apart from them, ſeeing we neither can now do it, nor hope that afterward we may do it with them. And this our Neceſſity is heightned, and our Caſe made yet more different from theirs at the *Reformation*, when we conſider, That that was a time of *Reformatio*, *Status convaleſcentiæ*; ours is rather *ſtatus decidentiæ*, a time of *Encreaſing*, rather than of *Diminiſhing* the number of *Superſtitions*, and coming nearer the *Popiſh* Modes, rather than going further from them. Inſtances of this are not a few; take for a taſte the allowing of Plays on the Lord's day; (the zealous promoting of the Book of Sports by that party, is not yet forgotten) whereas that day was, *Art.* 24. of King *Edw.* the 6's *Injunctions*, before mentioned, appointed *to be given wholly to God in hearing the Word of God read and taught in private and publick Prayers, &c.* A further Conviction in this Matter may be abundantly had from a Book entituled, *The Advances of* England *toward* Popery; which Book, tho' our Reverend Author labours to diſparage, p. 35. of his Preface, yet agreeth ſo well with what men ſee with their Eyes, that it is not fit to be ſlighted; for, *Tho' ſome be mentioned, and blamed in that Book that appeared moſt zealous againſt* popery, *yet it is no Rarity for Words and Deeds to claſh. Quid verba*

an-

audio cum facta videam? And if it be true, that the Author before his death was ſenſible of the Injury he had done to ſome, yet his Evidence that he bringeth will ſtill be compared with what every one ſaw to be the tendency of ſome mens way. I might here alledge the obligation of the *National Covenant* that we are under, as they were not to whom the Dr. would make our Caſe parallel, tho I never thought, that that Bond made any new Duties or Sins, that were not ſuch antecedently; yet the Oath of God maketh the Tye that we are under to Duty, and againſt Sin, more weighty, and aggravateth the ſin of doing what is contrary to it; but of this afterwards. I conclude then, that the preſent Reaſons of Separation would not have held from the beginning of the Reformation, *quod erat probandum.*

Sect. 5. The learned Dr. (p. 2.) after explaining the terms of his Aſſertion which we have denied, proveth the Identity of Reaſon, in their Caſe and ours, by *the Ceremonies, Liturgy*, &c. *being the ſame.* Let all this be admitted; as they were diſſatisfied with theſe then, ſo are we now; but we join not in theſe practices, as they did, and worſhip God without them, as they did not; becauſe our Caſe doth not make theſe things appear ſo needful as theirs did, becauſe we have no Hope of *Reformation*, as they had; beſide our being under an additional Tye againſt ſuch *Superſtitions*, which they were not under. Not content with this, the Dr. thinks to prove, that we are more obliged to join in the *Church's Worſhip*, than thoſe at the Reformation: 1. Becauſe of the *Number, Diligence, and Learning of our allowed Preachers.* 2. Becauſe *the Ceremonies are retrenched.* 3. Becauſe of *the Miſchiefs that we have ſeen of Separation.* To the firſt I anſwer; As what we complain of in the preſent Miniſtry, is not the Ground of our with-drawing (though it is a ſad Grievance, and tendeth to make the Ordinances of the Lord to be abhorred in the Eyes of the people; as the ways of *Eli*'s Sons did, 1 *Sam.* 2. 17.) ſo neither can their Commendation by him given, be a ſufficient Reaſon for our joining in corrupted Ordinances. I confeſs, the number of the preſent Miniſters is greater than in thoſe days, the generality of the Clergy continuing Popiſh; and I am far from derogating from ſome among them, who are learned and diligent (and I add) pious men, and ſound Proteſtants: But as for the far greateſt part of the *Pariſh Miniſters*, that the people are moſt edified by, or diſappointed of their Edification, they are either Strangers to *England*, or ſtrangely byaſſed, who ſee not cauſe

to

to complain of their *Ignorance, Idleneß, and vitious Converſation*, if not of all theſe three. To the Second; I know not what retrenchment hath been made of *Ceremonies*, ſince the beginning of Q. *Elizabeth*'s Reign, but I know Additions have been made, if not as to Impoſing, yet as to Uſe, and ſome Additions to the Holidays hath been impoſed; but if they were fewer than they are, they are enough to corrupt the Worſhip of God, and furniſh as ſtrong an Argument to forbear ſuch corrupted Worſhip, as if they were more numerous. A grain of *Arſenick* may juſtly make one forbear a Diſh in which it is, as well as if there were two or three in it. To the Third; As he hath ſeen *Miſchiefs of Separation*, and we do not extenuate them, ſo have we of *Impoſitions*, yea, all the *Miſchiefs* of that kind are juſtly imputable to theſe *Impoſitions*, they being the Cauſe of the *Separation*; and, *cauſa cauſæ eſt cauſa cauſati*. Our Anceſtors had hope of freedom from that Yoke, as hath been ſaid, which we have not; therefore no Inconvenience (that is not our Sin) can warrant us to join with, and in the depravations of the Worſhip of God, which were our Sin, as neither can ſuch inconvenience excuſe us to live without Ordinances alwaies, as the former *Non-conformiſts* might do for a time.

Sect. 6. In his 2. *Section*, he cometh to the proof of the other part of his Aſſertion, to wit, *That there was no Separation practiſed or allowed by thoſe who were moſt Zealous for the Reformation.* He confeſſeth *there were different apprehenſions about ſome few Things*; but denieth *that they were the Things now Scrupled at*, *and that any Separation was made becauſe of them.* I ſhall not much diſpute either of theſe, becauſe the Cauſe that I defend is not much concerned in them, but ſtandeth on a better foundation, than the opinions or practices of men: And becauſe our caſe and reaſons differs from theirs as hath been ſhewed, yet ſhall I a little examine what he alledgeth under both theſe heads. For the former of them; he proveth it only from *Mr. Rogers, Scrupling only the ſquare Cap and Tippet*; and *B. Hooper Scrupling only the Epiſcopal Habit, to which afterward he ſubmitted*: And Bucer *and others ſcrupled the Liturgy till it was reformed, but none after that ſcrupled any of the Things now in Controverſy.* Here is *Fallacious* if not falſe Hiſtory, for with *Rogers and Hooper*, called *Ring-leaders of the party* by one who was no friend to them, are reckoned *others who had fled beyond Sea, and ſucked in both the Air and Diſcipline of the place where they lived, and renounced all Ceremonies practiſed by Papiſts, conceiving that ſuch ought not on-*

ly to be clipt with the Sheers, but to be ſhaved with the Razor; yea, all the ſtums thereof to be pluckt out. Fuller *Ch. Hiſt.* Lib. 7. pa. 402. Theſe *fugitives* (if it be not too bad a name for them) I underſtand of *Hen.* 8's. Reign of whom *Fox*, *Act. and Mon. Book* 3. p. 145. in the Hiſtory of *Hooper*, one of them, they being alſo joined with them by *Fuller*. Is all this no more than two mens ſcrupling only ſome Habits? Or is not here rather a conſiderable number exactly of our opinion about all *humane Ceremonies* in the worſhip of God? 2. What he ſaith of Mr. *Rogers* is a very Imperfect Repreſentation of him, *for Fox, Act. and Monu.* Vol. 3. pa. 131. (the place which he citeth) ſaith no ſuch thing, as that this was Mr. *Rogers* only ſcruple: and Mr. *Fuller* (*loco citato*) ſaith the contrary. Mr. *Fox* is telling a ſtory of his Diſſent from a Determination of the Biſhops and Clergy in the Reign of *Edw.* 6. for wearing of *Prieſts Caps* and other Attire belonging to that order: Mr. *Rogers* ſaid, *He would not agree to that decree of uniformity, unleſs it be alſo decreed, that the Papiſts for a difference betwixt them and others, ſhould wear on their ſleeves a Chalice with an Hoſt upon it*; which ſheweth his factious and reſolute way of refuſing that thing, on that occaſion, rather than, that he did not ſcruple any thing elſe; and it hath no ſhew of probability that ſuch a wiſe and holy man, would ſtick at that, and not at other *Ceremonies*, that had as little warrant, and were more intrinſick to Religion and worſhip, and ſo leſs in the power of men to be Determined.

Sect. 7. 3. We may ſay the ſame of excellent *Hooper* who was long at *Zurick*, and very dear to *Bullinger*, and one of thoſe that *had ſuck'd in the Air and Diſcipline of the Places where they lived, and were for rooting out of Ceremonies.* He was a Ring-leader of theſe, and this his ſcrupling the *Epiſcopal Habit* is never mentioned as the whole of his Opnion about *Ceremonies*, but is taken notice of on a particular Occaſion. For his after ſubmiſſion; it was by the force of Temptation, being in priſon, and Deſerted by his patron, the *Earl of Warwick*. *Fuller ubi ſupra*, p. 404. And with what reluctancy he did it, ſee *p.* 405. 4. That *on the review of the Liturgy in the Reign of King* Edw. 6. *there was little or no Diſſatisfaction left; at leaſt as to the things now ſcrupled*, is ſtill *falſe Hiſtory*; for that review was *Anno* 1547. *Full. Ch. Hiſt. Lib.* 7. *p.* 386. whereas 1550. he telleth us *pa.* 402. of two parties diſcovered, *Conformiſts* and *Nonconformiſts*, and the one againſt all the *Ceremonies*.

Sect. 8. That there was no ſeparation at firſt he next aſſerteth;

but

but people (tho ſcrupling them) complyed with the uſe of *Liturgies* and *Cerimonies*. May be it was ſo at the very firſt, while *Reformation* was hopefully going on. I have already ſhewed why we are not bound by ſuch Examples: I ſhall now Apologize for the unimitable practice of thoſe holy men, to excuſe them *atanto*, though not *atoto*. The glorious Change that then was wrought in the *Church*, did ſo affect them, & engage their zealous hearts to Gods Ordinances, that they did not ſo throughly conſider, as they ought, the ſinfulneſs of the *Ceremonies*: They had got ſo many things reformed, the evil of which was ſo incomparably beyond that of the *Ceremonies*, that theſe ſeemed as nothing to them. It is known that the limitted & ſcant powers of our Souls, our Underſtandings, Affections; yea, our Senſes are by ſome vehement Objects ſo diverted, as that meaner Objects at the ſame time cannot move them, nor be noticed by them. It was much that theſe men diſcovered any evil in the *Ceremonies*, but that the principles that the Reformation was built on led them to that; (to wit) That *Scripture* is the Rule by which the Affairs of the Houſe of God muſt be ordered; but it is no wonder that they did not ſo fully diſcover the Evil of them, nor were ſo affected with it, as we who have had longer time and leſs hindrance to think on theſe things. I am far from thinking, that they had either leſs Light, or leſs tenderneſs of Conſcience than we, but that their Mind and Conſcience were exerciſed about higher Matters, which we have (through the Lord's goodneſs) ſo ſettled to our hand, that reforming of theſe is not our Work. They were imployed to do the hardeſt part of the Work; to caſt out *Antichriſtianiſm*; it was left to others that ſucceeded them to caſt out of the Houſe a little of *Antichriſt*'s Furniture, that had been forgotten, or by minding greater things, over-lookt, lying in ſome corners of the Houſe: So that it doth no more inferr blame on us for forbearing the uſe of the Ceremonies that they uſed them, while they reformed the *Church* from *Popery*, than it was a Blame to *Hezekiah*, *Joſiah*, and ſuch Reformers, who took away the High Places that other Reformers had left, when they threw out *Baal's Worſhip*.

Sect. 9. This may ſatisfie an unbyaſſed mind, that our non-compliance with the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* is conſiſtent with all that reſpect that is due to thoſe excellent Perſons, who in the beginning of the *Reformation* practiſed otherwiſe; for we owe ſuch reſpect to no man, nor men, as to reckon them infallible in Opinion or Practice. Alſo what hath been ſaid, may take off the edge of the Dr's

jeering Insinuations, That *these things are now such Bug-bears to scare People from our Communion, and make them cry out in such dreadful manner, of the mischief of* Impositions, *as though the Church must unavoidably be broken in pieces by the weight and burden of two or three unsupportable Ceremonies.* We have little Answer to this sort of Argumentation, only we say, It is not Childish Fear, but Conscience guided by Scripture, that feareth us; neither do we count these Ceremonies such as will break (tho' they defile) the Church, but they are too heavy for our Consciences to bear, and the example of men using them, can yield us no ease of this Burden. When the Dr. doth thus ridicule the *Scruples of Conscience*, that his opposites pretend to have, either he thinketh, that an *Erring Conscience* is to be cured by contempt and scorn, or that we do only pretend to Conscience in our Dissent: The former is no sign of a good *Casuist*, nor the latter of a good *Christian*, for such will *not judge, lest they be judged.* He stormeth much at two Expressions of one of his Antagonists; one is, That it is unreasonable, that Men should create a necessity of *Separation*, and then complain of the Impossibility of *Union*: *Hath our Church* (saith he) *made new Terms of Communion, or altered the old ones?* *Ans.* Though the *Terms of Communion* be not new, as to the matter of them, they are perpetuated on new grounds, which make them now harder to be submitted to than before, for they were brought in at first on a *present Necessity*, as then was thought, the Nation being *Popish*, and ready to abandon the *Reformation*, if that was offended. Now it is not so; they were continued in a Reforming time, and now fixed in a time when no such thing is to be expected, but rather the contrary: They were retained in the Morning twilight of the *Reformation*, but now in the Noon-day of Gospel-light long shining among us, fixed in perpetuity, so that the present Prelates give a new Being to these *Stumbling-blocks*; especially, they are new grounds of *Separation*, because now they are scrupled at more than at first; and though the things were before, yet they did not such Mischief then as now; and therefore, they who continued them when thus hurtful, (though it were granted, that the hurt of them arose from the mistake of the Scruplers) do create a necessity of Separation, while they may remove these scandals, and will not. But they that scruple, cannot remove their Scruples. The other Expression is, That *continuing of the Ceremonies, is, venturing our Peace in an old Worm-eaten Bottom*; which the Dr. against all Reason, understandeth of the *Reformation*, but is indeed to be understood

of

of the *Ceremonies*. The *Reformation* is founded on *Scripture*, a ſure and ſound Foundation. The *Ceremonies* on Mens Will and Authority, and therefore juſtly termed *a Worm-eaten Bottom*. That he ſaith, *There was no* Non-conformiſts *in K.* Edw. 6. *days*, is before diſproved; and if there had not, while we can give Scripture-ground for our *Non-conformity*, we need not be aſhamed, tho' Martyrs and other Reformers acted otherwiſe.

Sect. 10. That Dr. *Ames* can bring no other Inſtances but *Rogers* and *Hooper*, is nothing againſt us, who have before ſhewed that a Party they had, of whom they were the Ring-leaders. He ſeemeth, p. 5. to lay ſome weight on *P. Martyr* and *Bucer*, perſwading *Hooper* to ſubmit to the *Epiſcopal Habit*; I deny not but they did ſo, and he at laſt yielded to their Advice; but *P. Martyr*, in the Epiſtle cited by the Dr. (to wit) *Ep. Theolog. Hoopero*, p. *mihi*, 1085. doth there fully declare his diſlike of theſe things, and of all Humane Inventions in God's Worſhip, only that for the neceſſity that then was, adviſeth the Uſe of them; as the Apoſtles on the like ground (as he there mentioneth) forbad *eating of things ſtrangled*, &c. He highly commendeth *Hooper*'s Zeal in endeavouring, *Ut ad caſtam ſimplicemq; puritatem chriſtiana religio denuo aſpiret*; and deſireth, *Ut omnia paulatim reſecentur ---- quæ parùm aut nihil habent, quæ ad ſolidam ædificationem referri poſſint, & redundare potius & ſuperflua quodammodo a piis animis judicantur.* And he commendeth the practice at *Strasburg*, (where he lived) *Ubi veſtrum diſcrimina quoad ſacra ſunt ſublata*, as being *Morem candidiorem & apprime reſipientem Apoſtolicam eccleſiam*: And after he ſaith, *Accendit hoc meum deſiderium, partim quod in ritibus, quam proxime vellem ad ſacras literas accedere, atq; meliorum temporum eccleſiæ imitatione perſequi, partim quod animadverto, papæ ſectatores adhuc his reliquiis conari ſpeciem ſaltem miſſæ inſtaurare*: And afterwards, *Si paterentur prius evangelium & propagari & altas radices agere, melius fortaſſe & facilius perſuaderentur homines ut hos externos apparatus removerent.* And he addeth a Similitude of one that was ſick, and recovered by degrees, who cannot forbear the uſe of ſome unfit things, that in health he will willingly put away. Doth not all this fully expreſs what I have already ſaid, That all the Ceremonies ought to have been caſt out at firſt? That the Reformers, partly by the Church's, and their want of due light (like one in a ſtate of Convaleſcency) and partly out of a deſign to gain, and not offend the Papiſts, did for a time retain theſe *Ceremonies*, with a deſign to have them afterward removed? And is it not plain, that

that *P. Martyr*, under our circumſtances, would be a *Non conformiſt* as well as we? The opinion of this good man is yet more clear, and againſt the Dr. out of another Epiſtle, *Amico cuidam in Anglia*, who none that readeth the Letter, and knoweth the Hiſtory, can doubt to be *Hooper*, p. (*mihi*) 1126, 1127. where he ſaith, *De pileo vero rotundo vel habitu, extra ſacra geſtando, non arbitramur eſſe plus quam oportet rixandum, at de veſtibus ut Sacris in miniſterio ipſo adhibendis cum ſpeciem Miſſæ referant, & ſunt meræ papatus reliquiæ, Dominus* Bullingerus *cenſet non eſſe illis utendum; ego vero etſi uſui ejuſmodi ornamentorum ſemper ſum adverſatus —— idcirco tardior eram ad ſuadendum, ut potius epiſcopatum abdicares, quam ut illarum veſtium uſum recipieres; attamen quia ſcandala ejus generis vidi prorſus evitanda, propterea in ejus ſententiam facile ceſſi.* He after adviſeth, that he may not act againſt his Conſcience, and ſheweth, that he himſelf, when at *Oxford*, though he were *Canonicus*, yet would never wear the Surplice in the *Quire*. I ſay nothing of *Bucer*, not having his Book, *Script. Anglican.* but it is reaſonable to think that he was of the ſame mind.

Sect. 11. That Mr. *Bradford* was a *Non-conformiſt* he cannot deny, but ſaith, *A good man had an unreaſonable Scruple.* Might not we anſwer the ſame way to all his Allegations of the *Martyrs* and *firſt Reformers* compliance with the Ceremonies; (to wit) That good men did not ſcruple where it was reaſonable that they ſhould. The words that he cited out of the *Act. and Monument. Vol.* 3. *P.* 319. where Mr. *Bradford* calleth Martyrdom the Lord's Cognizance, and not *Tippets, &c.* do rather make againſt than for his Deſign; for it's plain, that he putteth *Tippets, &c.* in the ſame Rank with *Shaven Crowns*, and calleth them *Antichriſtian Baggage*; and no reaſon can be given why theſe ſhould be ſo called, except that they are brought into Religion by Man, not by God; which agreeth to all the *Ceremonies.* Who they were that kept ſecret Meetings under B. *Ridley*, it is needleſs to enquire. The Dr. gueſſeth, that they were *furious Anabaptiſts* or *ſecret Papiſts.* I know no reaſon for this gueſs; but becauſe he is reſolved that there ſhall be no *Non-conformiſts* then, ſuch as are now; but that there then were ſome excellent men, who diſliked the Ceremonies, I have ſhewed; that ſome of them did uſe them notwithſtanding, I acknowledge. That any did ſeparate, I do not undertake to prove; nor can he prove the contrary, ſo much as probably. I am ſure, there were Principles then maintained by a Party of men, which would have made them do as we do, if their Practice had been ſufficiently

ently adapted to the Sentiments that they had about the Ceremonies, which maketh it not unprobable that ſome of them did withdraw; though it may be the men of more note among them, who conſidered the neceſſity of their Caſe, as warranting that Practice, might do otherwiſe; but it is no way likely, that the Church did ſo furiouſly impoſe theſe things on the Conſciences of Scruplers, as we are now impoſed on.

Sect. 12. The Dr's long Harrangue, p. 6, 7. to condemn our practice by the contrary practice of the firſt Reformers, doth either prove nothing, or it concludeth, that it is poſſible that ſuch holy Men could miſtake: Which before he himſelf had imputed to holy Mr. *Bradford*, one of them here mentioned by him. Their Holineſs, Learning, Integrity, Induſtry, profound Judgment, Mortification, did not entitle them to *Infallibility*. Were it not eaſie to name many more men of all theſe excellent qualities, who have had their *Nevi*? The laying ſuch weight on men, hath been an uſeful tool to build up *Antichriſtian Babel*, by taking People off from eyeing Scripture Authority in the matters of Chriſt, and putting that of Men in its room. Doth the Dr. thing it ſtrange, that a diſſenting Artificer (a term ſuited to that Contempt of *Non-conformiſts* that his Book is full of) ſhould be in the right, when one more Holy and Learned than he is in the wrong; eſpecially in things of that moment that the Ceremonies are of? For, I look on it as *taunting*, not *diſputing*, to talk of *the mighty importance of the Ceremonies to the Souls of Men; the Beams of Unlawfulneſs in them, of which a Mote could not be ſeen by the Reformers*; we count them of ſuch Importance, as a tender Conſcience ought to refuſe them, and yet not of ſuch *mighty Importance* as many other things are. We ſee a *Mote*, not *Beams*, of unlawfulneſs in them, whatever our Anceſtors thought of them: Neither is this becauſe of a *dark and Jewiſh Diſpenſation that they were under, while all the clear Goſpel-Light of Diviſion and Separation is reſerved for our Times*, as the Author pleaſantly dreams that we think; they were not ſo favoured with a general Sun-ſhine of Light as we are, Popiſh Darkneſs being then but going away: But for the *Light of Diviſion and Separation*, we look on it as *groſs Darkneſs*, and leave it to our impoſing Brethren, who cauſe the Diviſion. Neither was it the Reformer's want of Zeal for Religion, but want of Light and Zeal againſt *Ceremonies*, that cauſed their different Practice from ours; they Burnt for the former, not for the latter. Neither is it ſtrange, that they ſhould have no ſuſpicion of the unlawfulneſs

of

of these things, when they went to suffer, seeing these things never were controverted between them & their Persecutors. Was it never heard of, that true Martyrs had Mistakes that were extrinsick to that on which their Sufferings were stated? What he citeth out of *Jacob*, the *Non-conformist* against *Johnson* the *Separatist*, p. 7. doth not touch our Case, for the *Separatists* that then were, went on other Grounds than we do; of which after; and if Mr. *Jacob* used some Arguments that were ill grounded, let him answer for it.

Sect. 13. As to the Historical Account that he giveth, *Sect.* 3. of the *English Exiles in Queen* Mary's *Reign at* Frankford, and elsewhere, I shall not controvert it, only I shall make a few Animadversions on it, having first in general noted, That it is no wonder (nor is it argumentative against us, who take Scripture, not Mens Opinions for our Rule) that they who in *England* were inured to that less-pure way of Worship, did cleave to it abroad, till by seeing and learning a way more consonant to Scripture, they fell in with that: And it is as little to be wondred at, that some gave more pliable Ears to the right way that they were instructed in, in strange places; and others clave more obstinately to that they had been bred with; (we know what a prejudice Education causeth) and hence arose those Contests that he mentioneth. If he could prove (as he cannot) that all the *Non-conformity* that is in *England*, was brought from beyond Sea, he saith nothing, unless he also prove, that it was not brought out of the Scripture. We must not reject every thing in Religion that is not of *English Original*, lest we by so doing throw off both *Christianity* and *Protestantism*.

Sect. 10. In particular, I first take notice of what he saith, p. 8. *These* (English Exiles) *with the People in all other places*, Geneva *excepted, kept to the Orders established in our Church.* Here is a notable Falshood, (to wit) That all the *Exiles* kept to the Orders of the *Church of England*; himself excepteth those at *Frankford*; and Mr. *Fuller*, above-cited, telleth us of a Party of *Non-conformists*, before that time in *England*, headed by *Rogers* and *Hooper*; no doubt some of them fled from the *Marian* Persecution, and it is not probable they would use the *Ceremonies* that here grieved them, when they were under no Law to compel them. Another thing that I take notice of, is, He challengeth Mr. *Baxter* for saying, That at *Frankford* the Contest was between them who were for the *English Liturgy*, and them who were for a more free way of *Praying*; but I see not how this is disproved by him; the Confirmation of it may be ra-

rather gathered from the Accompt he giveth of these Debates, p. 9. (to wit) that when the Magistrates first required them not to dissent from the *French* in Doctrine or *Ceremonies*, and then took off that restraint: Yet they altered the *English order*, and brought it nearer to the *French Model*; which we know doth not impose a *Liturgy*, nor restrain *free Prayer*; but at most propoſeth a *Directory*, wherein are some set Forms, as helps to them that need them. To say, that those who laid aside the *Responses*, *Litany*, *and Surplice*, *and many other things*, were still for the *English Liturgy*, is to speak at random. But he omitteth a material passage, (because it maketh against him) with which *Fuller*, *Ch. Hist. lib.* 8. p. 27. supplieth us, out of the same History that the Dr. citeth, (to wit) *The Troubles at* Frankford: That *they laid aside the Liturgy*, *Surplice and other Ceremonies in Service and Sacraments*, *both as superfluous*, *and superstitious*: wherein then did they differ from *Non-conformists*?

Sect. 14. He saith, p. 9. That *the Question among them was not*, *Whether a Liturgy*, *or not*; *but whether the Order of Divine Service*, *was not to be accommodated*, *as much as might be*, *to the* French. This is to confess, that they did not contend for the *English Liturgy*, as he telleth us some others did, who were dissatisfied with their deserting of it. But I further Assert, That the Controversy was between a *Liturgy* and *Directory*, to wit, between the way of *England*, and that of the *French Protestants*, who have no *Liturgy*, but as other Protestant *Churches* had; an order of publick worship, for directing unqualified Ministers; such many behoved to be in the beginning of *Reformation* from *Popery*, to the set Forms, in which they were not tied, whom the Lord had competently gifted for the Work of the Ministry: So as in the best Reformed *Churches*; these *Directories* were by Degrees disused, as Crutches are by a Lame Man, as he recovereth the use of his Limbs. p. 10. He telleth us of some resolute *Conformists* at *Zurick* and *Strasburg*, who were earnest with the *Non-conformists* at *Frankford*. We deny not that there were such among them, who suffered for *Protestantism*. What those of *Frankford* say p. 10. *of not defacing King* Edward's *Laws*, must be understood of Laws for the *Protestant Religion*, not of those for *Ceremonies*; otherwise it had been *protestatio contraria facto*; and p. 11. Their *not dissenting from their Brethren wholly at the ransom of their Lives for this Doctrine*, must needs have the same interpretion, if we will reconcile them to themselves. And their extenua-

ting, as much as might be the Alterations they had made, ſheweth them to be peaceable Men, that ſhun Offence, if poſſible; but doth not prove them to be for the *Engliſh Liturgy*; yea, or for any *Liturgy*.

Sect. 15. He ſpeaketh (p. 11.) of *Knox* and *Whittingham*, *finding their* (the Exiles at *Frankford*'s) *Zeal for the Engliſh Liturgy*, deſired *Calvin*'s judgment of it. I find no ſuch *Zeal* at *Frankford*, for the *Engliſh Liturgy*: but the Dr. will have it ſo in deſpite of Hiſtory, that telleth us of their laying aſide its *Ceremonies as Superfluous, and Superſtitious*: of which before. It was not thoſe of *Frankford*, but of *Strasburg*, whoſe Zeal for the Liturgy (if it may be ſo called, for they deſire but the Subſtance of it to be retained; quitting the *Ceremonies*, and things which the Country could bear) occaſioned the calling for *Calvin*'s Judgment. *Fuller, Ch. Hiſt. lib.* 8. *ſ.* 3. *p.* 29, 30. out of *Troubles of Frankford*, p. 24. In giving Accompt of *Calvin*'s Anſwer to their Deſire, he repreſenteth *Calvin* as byaſſed and ſelfiſh; *being throughly heated in a cauſe, that ſo nearly concerned him*: It had been fairer to have refuted his opinion, than to judge his Thoughts and Motives. He ſaith alſo, that what *Calvin* thought *moſt unfit*, yet he thought *tolerable*. *Calvin* ſaith not ſo, *pace tua dixerim*, he ſaith, There were in it, *multæ tolerabiles ineptiæ*; not that all things in it were ſuch: Any that know *Calvin*'s Principles will ſay, that he thought ſome things in it no *ineptiæ*, and other things not *tolerabiles*. And what he ſaith of the Tolerableneſs of theſe *fooleries* is no more, but that they might be born with for a time; becauſe they could not be corrected *primo ſtatim die*. He doth then not count them tolerable; for he approveth them that appeared againſt them (tho he Condemneth the moſt unſeaſonable conteſt, that was in that Church) *neque tamen* (ſaith he) *eorum Conſtantiam reprehendo, qui, ut pro juſta cauſa depugnent, in vilem contentionem trahuntur*. He ſpeaketh of theſe things, as not to have been tolerated, even in *England*, after the Progreſs of the Reformation. *Si hactenus in Anglia viguiſſet ſincera religio, aliquod in melius correctum multaque detracta eſſe oportuit*. Much more to this purpoſe is in that *Epiſt.* which is (*mihi*) 200, cited by the Dr. for 164. It is true, he ſpeaketh *of his eaſineſs, to yield in indifferent things, ſuch as are External Rites*. This muſt be underſtood of Rites common to Religion: and others, not of ſacred Ceremonies; or if of thoſe, it is for a Time of urgent neceſſity, not always, that they may be Tolerated. That *Calvin* gave no incouragement to *Separation*, if the

the *Ceremonies* were continued, is said *gratis*; and in defiance of his own Words, while he commendeth them, who ſtood up againſt them; and the Sequel proved, that *Calvin* was ſo underſtood by them who regarded his judgment; for *Fuller*, p. 31, 32. giveth us the Story of their hard uſage by the other party; and of their departure from them, being Headed by *Whittingham*, after *Knox*'s removal, and ſetteth down the Names of them, who *ſeparated* themſelves from the Congregation of *Frankford*.

Sect. 16. He denieth (p. 12.) That *Calvin was in his Judgment for free Prayer*, becauſe in his *Ep.* 55. (*mihi* 87.) to the *Protector* of *England*; *he approveth a certain form*, and giveth Reaſons for it. It is evident, that *Calvin* giveth this Advice for the neceſſity of the Church, that then was, *Popery* being then ſcarce well removed, and there being few Paſtors tolerably gifted for their work, and ſome who Laboured to ſow the Seeds of *Errors* in Chriſts newly dreſſed Fields, whom he calleth *cerebroſos homines*; I ſuppoſe he meaneth the *Anabaptiſts*. That *Calvin* deſigned no more, by this is manifeſt, both becauſe at *Geneva*, and other Churches that owned *Calvin*'s Doctrine, Prayer was not reſtrained by an impoſed *Liturgy*; but mens infirmity relieved by ſome forms alſo; becauſe *Calvin*, in the ſame Letter to the Protector, adviſeth, that all the abuſes brought into Popery, ſhould be removed; and that by bringing back things to Chriſt's Inſtitution, as the Apoſt. doth, 1 Cor. 11. 23. *Inde* (ſaith he) *colligendi generalis Doctrina, tum de legitima reformatione & quæ Deo accepta ſit; igitur ad ipſum purum dei verbum redeundum nobis eſſe, etenim ſupererunt mixturæ ex hominum ingenio prolatæ, totidem extabunt pollutiones quæ homines diſtrahant a recto eorum uſu quæ Dominus in ipſorum ſalutem inſtituerat*, and much more to that purpoſe: No *Non-conformiſts* will deſire a further Reformation, than *Calvin* there adviſeth to; however he was forbearing with ſome things for the preſent neceſſity, as good men then generally were. He telleth us that the *Ceremonies* (making no exception of the few that were retained) were *lenocinia quæ miſeras animas ad malum perducerent*: That no *Admonition* againſt the abuſe of them, will hinder men to be hardened by them. He confeſſeth that *Ceremonies* ſhould be Accommodated to the Peoples Capacity, but we muſt beware, leaſt under that pretext, any thing be left that proceedeth from *Satan* or *Antichriſt*; and compareth ſuch a way of reforming to leaving of the *High Places* untaken away. He blameth leaving of ſome things unreformed, to ſhun the *Diſſatisfaction* of

ſome; and ſaith, that in our own Matters ſuch yielding is allowable, not in Gods matters; and that God will be with us, if we keep his way, whatever Men think or act againſt us. Who ever, without prejudice, readeth that excellent *Ep.* will not look on *Calvin*, as a Favourer of either the *Engliſh Liturgy*, or *Humane Ceremonies*.

Sect. 17. He doth very unduly repreſent *Calvin*'s Judgment expreſſed in his *Ep.* to *Cox* and his Brethren, 165 (*mihi* 206.) He there mentioneth nothing miſ-repreſented to him, ſave that *Cox* and his Party had preciſely urged the *Engliſh Ceremonies*, and that they would remit nothing of them: But now by their Letter he perceived, that they had ſhewed themſelves *magis humanos & tractabiles*: Here indeed are different Repreſentations; but not of the State of the Controverſie, or things controverted: Which of them was trueſt, we ſhall ſee a little after. It is falſe to ſay, That he expreſſeth himſelf ſatisfied, that the matter was ſo compoſed among them; his Words are, *Totum negotium placide fuiſſe compoſitum gaudeo*; he was pleaſed with their peace, not with their deciſion. And that this was falſly by *Cox*, and the reſt, repreſented to *Calvin*, will appear, when I ſhall ſhew that their Debate made a very unpeaceable end. *Calvin* doth not mention *Lights* to be an Excuſe for his Letter; but Them and *Croſſes*, he mentioneth as ſuperſtitious uſages to be aboliſhed: Neither needed he a *miſerable ſhift* to excuſe any thing that he had written: His firſt Letter on *Knox* and *Whittingham*'s Information, adviſing the aboliſhing of the *Ceremonies*; his ſecond on *Cox*'s Information, applauding their ſuppoſed peaceableneſs, which he rejoiced in, tho he could not obtain his firſt deſire.

Sect. 18. That they at *Frankford* did *compromiſe the matter*, as he alledgeth, p. 13. I do not find. *Fuller* ſaith, p. 30. *That* Calvin's *Letter ſtruck ſuch a ſtroke, eſpecially in the Congregation at* Frankford, *that ſome therein, who formerly partly approved, did afterwards wholly diſlike; and more who formerly diſliked, did now deteſt the Engliſh Liturgy.* Our Author telleth us of Dr. *Cox*'s ſetting up the *Litany*, *which put* Knox *in a rage, ſo as he declaimed againſt the Engliſh Church, as far as his Wit and Ill-will could carry him.* Woe to the World, if ſuch partial and falſe Hiſtory carry the Day! But we ſee what we are to think of the moſt ancient and remote Hiſtory, when, ſo near our own time, matters of Fact are ſo unjuſtly repreſented. *Fuller*, *ubi ſupra*, telleth us, *That Dr.* Cox, *a Man of high Spirit, with*

with ſome of his Friends, arrived there, and, March 13. *diſcompoſe the Model of their Service; firſt anſwering aloud after the Miniſter, and on the Sunday following, one of his Company, without the Conſent and Knowledge of the Congregation, got up into the Pulpit, and there read all the Litany*; and Citeth for this, *Troubles of* Frankford, p. 38. whereat *Knox* highly offended, Preaching from his *Ordinary* Text, ſhewed the *Engliſh Book* to be *Superſtitious, Unpure* and *Imperfect*. Is here any thing of Rage, or what did not become ſober Zeal for God, and his Ordinances, which were interrupted in their peaceable Adminiſtration by a proud Stranger, intruding into the Pulpit without a call from the Miniſter or the *Church*?

Sect. 19. We are told by the Dr. *ibid.* from a Letter of *Grindal* to *Ridley*, that the *Church at* Frankford *was well quieted by the Prudence of Mr.* Cox *and others, which met there, for that purpoſe*: But a more Impartial Hiſtorian (out of the Book that the Dr. pretendeth to follow), tho he be no *Non-conformiſt*, telleth us what a peaceable end this Debate came to; even ſuch an end, as a bloody Victory uſeth to bring to an unhappy War: And ſuch a Peace as the *Non-conformiſts* in *England* at this day have under Prelatiſts of the ſame temper with Dr. *Cox*; and ſuch as the poor *Jews* had in *Shuſhan*, when the *King* and *Haman ſate down to eat and drink*, Eſth. 3. 15. The fore-cited Author, p. 30, 31. telleth how *Cox* prevailed by *new Recruits out of* England: *And* Knox's *Party again by the Favour of the Magiſtrate, and the* French *Miniſters*: *And that* Cox's *Party being depreſſed, embraced a ſtrange way to raiſe themſelves, and accuſe* Knox *to the State, of Treaſon againſt the Emperour*; *and that in Eight places of a Book of his.* The ſeven laſt the Hiſtorian ſaith, may be well Omitted. The firſt is, *That he called the Emperour no leſs an Enemy to Chriſt, than was* Nero. This the Impartial Hiſtorian cryeth out on; the Words being ſpoken ſome Years before in *England*, by one that owned no Natural Allegiance to the *Emperour*; that they ſhould be charged on him, by Men of his own Religion, in Exile with him, to the endangering of his Life: And of this, he ſaith, alluding to *Rachel*'s Words, *With great rather than good Wreſtling, have I wreſtled, and prevailed.* So was Mr. *Knox* adviſed by the Magiſtrate to depart; not *forbidden* by the Congregation (as the Dr. ſaith) *to Preach*: And thoſe that clave to him, were ſcattered. Here is *Epiſcopal Peace*, and here is a taſte of the Spirit and Methods, by which they carry on their Cauſe. But further, the ſame Author telleth us, how harſhly the *Coxians*

(it

(it is his own word) uſed the other party, ejecting their Church-Officers, without taking any notice of them, or asking their conſent. Alſo how they refuſed to let the matter come to Hearing or Arbitration, by which he ſaith, *Cox*'s party loſt much Reputation. How they reproached the other as *Schiſmaticks*, when they had made the *Shiſm* in a peaceable Church. And after he telleth us, how *Cox*'s party brake among themſelves about other things, oftner than once, and that to a ſcandalous heighth. Which may be ſeen at length in the Author. If this be convenient in a Congregation, let any judge; it is ſtrange that the Dr. and Mr. *Fuller* both, ſhould Read theſe Hiſtorical paſſages, with ſo different Spectacles.

Sect. 20. The Dr. telleth us, *Sect.* 4. *P.* 13, 14. That the Controverſy was not carried out of *England* with them, but as *Hooper* in *Switzerland*, ſo they in *Geneva*, and elſewhere, *got a better liking of their Church-way, than of Ours; that being ſuch as the Country would bear: And it is hard to remove Prejudices, eſpecially when they have ſuch Abetters, whoſe Authority goes beyond any Reaſon with them. And that is the true Foundation of our unhappy Differences, that yet continue.* I have abridged his Words; but given the full ſence of them. And now I ſhall Note a few things on this Diſcourſe. 1. He will not allow it, it ſeems, that *Non-conformiſts* of old, or late, have ever made the Bible the Rule of their worſhipping God: No, they are meer *Conſuetudinary Men*, and ſoon taken with any new Faſhion, and ſo Obſtinate, that they will not part with any Cuſtom, when once taken up. Thus he is pleaſed to picture thoſe that diſſent from him: We expected more Charity from him. 2. If *Non-conformiſts* cannot prove what they hold, by Scripture, and ſound Reaſon, let them lie under as much of his Reproach, as he ſhall pleaſe to caſt upon them. But if they can, I hope he will retract this raſh Cenſure. 3. If *Cuſtom* did ſo far *Influence* theſe men, methinks the Cuſtoms that they had firſt received in their native Country, ſhould have been a ſufficient Antidote againſt all Foreign Infection to the contrary. But their being taken with the way in other Countries, rather ſheweth, that their former way was built on *Cuſtom* and *Education*; and that the Change was from Scripture Light, that they had met with abroad, which they could not reſiſt. 4. I have ſhewed before, that they had theſe principles before they went abroad; even in King *Edward* 6's. Time, there were not a few of that way. 5. It is ſtrange that all Countries beſide *England*, are ſo Clowniſh, that they cannot bear the Pomp and Ceremonies of Divine Worſhip here uſed: How then

doth

doth Popery get any Entertainment beyond Sea, even among the *Swiſſers*; which Religion will vie with Ours in outward Splendor? If the Genius of a Nation did determine men in Religion (as the Dr. inſinuateth in this caſe) how is it that the *Ceremonies* are not uſed among the *Proteſtants in France*, which is the pattern for Modiſtneſs and Gaiety to *England*, and other parts of the World? but this is ſo indigeſted a Notion, that it doth not well become the Learning of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; tho it be good enough for ſome to rant with over a Pot of Ale. 6. Whether our party or his, be more guilty of *Obſtinate inſiſting on mens Authority, in defiance of Reaſon*, let the World judge. We are content to ſet aſide all the *Authority* of men, *Ancient* and *Modern*; and to referr our debate ſimply to the Determination of *Scripture*: But mens Authority is the Argument that the Dr. in this Book doth moſt inſiſt upon. I hope the Reader may by this time perceive, whether the Dr. doth truly or falſly Aſſign the Foundation of our *Differences*, which I, with him, acknowledge to be unhappy.

Sect. 21. He ſaith, p. 14. That in the *Engliſh Reformation*, they proceeded more out of reverence to the Ancient Church, than meer oppoſition to Popery (which ſome other Reformers made their Rule.) Here are two miſtakes not to be paſſed in ſilence: 1. The *Ancienteſt Church* had none of the Ceremonies; they were neither in the *Apoſtolick Church*, nor in that which was near it. How ancient they were, he will after give occaſion to enquire. So that *England* took for their pattern, the *Church* that was much declined both in *Antiquity* and *Purety*. 2. What can be more groſly falſe, than to ſay, that other *Reformers* made meer oppoſition to *Popery* with their rules. Two things make the contrary evident. 1. They did not reject all that *Papiſts* held, as, That there is one God, *&c.* 2. They rejected nothing of *Popery*, but what they gave other reaſons for, than that the *Papiſts* held it: (to wit) That it was contrary to Scripture, or not inſtituted by Chriſt; and ſo condemned in Scripture, as *vain Worſhip*, being a *Teaching for Doctrines, the Commandments of men*. We make Symbolizing with *Papiſts*, or other *Idolaters*, an Argument againſt the *Ceremonies*; but we reject them not on that account only; and ſo meer oppoſition to *Popery*, is not the rule of our *Reformation*.

Sect. 22. He complaineth that *Calvin* and others, did inſinuate, that the *Engliſh Reformation* was *Imperfect*. Nay, they openly maintained it; and ſo do we. He doth twice miſ-repreſent *Calvin's*

vin's Words, p. 14, 15. That he had *avowed in the Letter before-cited to the Protector, That the best Rule of Reformation, is, to go as far from Popery as they could.* No such Words are to be found in that Letter, nor any thing that will import so much. He doth indeed press the removing of all *Popish Ceremonies*, as having been abused to *Idolatry*; and citeth, *Psal.* 16. 4. Where *David* saith, That *he will not take up the names of idols in his mouth*, but he neither maketh this the *Rule*, nor the best *Rule* of *Reformation*. He knew that Scripture and Institution (which he had a little before-mentioned) was the *Rule*, and a far *better Rule* than that: Tho' even that hath its use to direct us in *Reformation* of the *Church*. Again, he saith, That *Calvin yieldeth to this Moderation, that such Ceremonies might be retained, as were easie, and fitted to the Capacity of the People; provided they were not such as had their beginning from the Devil, or Antichrist.* His words are, *Adeoque Ceremonias ipsas ad usum & captum esse accommodandas; sed non minus constanter affirmo, Videndum esse ne sub illo prætextu tolerentur quicquam quod a Satana vel Antichristo profectum sit.* Here is no advice to retain any *Humane Ceremonies*, but all of that sort fall under that Censure, they being not from God, and being Parts of Worship, they are from *Satan*, or *Antichrist*; but he would have all the Externals of Worship, so fitted to peoples capacity, as that they do not hinder, but rather help in the inward exercise of it. And if *Calvin* did yield in that *Infancy* of the *Reformation* (which I think he did not, otherwise he could not blame the *Imperfection* of it) That the *Ceremonies* might be retained, it maketh nothing for perpetuating of them. The Dr. saith, *They proceeded by this Rule of Moderation, taking away all the Ceremonies that were of late Invention:* And he saith, p. 14. That *the Ceremonies retained, were more ancient than the great Apostasy of the Roman Church.* It had been fit to have removed all that were of *Humane Invention*, for *Antiquity* can neither prejudice *Christ's Institutions*; nor warrant Mens. But it is not true, that all the *Ceremonies* retained were so ancient, as shall be made appear in due time, *viz.* Of *Kneelling* in the Act of receiving the *Lord's Supper*. Neither will it free our *Ceremonies* from being *Popish*, that they were before the great *Apostasy*, if it be made appear, that they were with a considerable degree of the *Apostasy*; yea, and a part of it.

Sect. 23. He endeavoureth to free our *Ceremonies* from *Popery*, because *the Cross is used by Papists in the Scrutinies before Baptism*; *we use*

uſe it after Baptiſm; and Kneeling is not ſtrictly required by the Roman *Church, in the act of Receiving; as appeareth by the Pope's ſitting, or a little leaning.* For the firſt, What great difference doth it make, whether Croſſing be uſed before or after Baptiſm, ſeeing it is not to be omitted, but belongeth to that Sacrament, as one of its Adjuncts? Our quarrel with it is not that it is uſed after Baptiſm, but that it is uſed, being none of *Chriſt's Inſtitutions*, but of *Man's Invention*, and abuſed in the Popiſh Adminiſtration of Baptiſm. For the Second, I hope he will not deny, that *Kneeling* in the act of Receiving is the conſtant Practice, and required among the *Papiſts*; and, That the Pope, who to them is above the Laws of God, ſhould be exempted from the Laws of their *Church*, is ſo inſignificant an Argument againſt *Kneeling*, being required by them, that I wonder to ſee it uſed by ſo Learned a man. For his *Plain Linen Garment, only uſed inſtead of many of the Popiſh Veſtments, which was uſed in the time of* Jerom *and* Auſtin; I deny that it is the only Veſtment that they uſe as appropriated to Religion and religious Perſons; any who read th the Book of *Canons*, made *Anno* 1603. *Can.* 74. may ſee the contrary, the Reverend Clergy there buſying themſelves to order the faſhion of Cloaths, that all of them ſhould uſe. But, that the *Surplice* is as ancient as *Hierom* and *Auguſtin*, I ſhall not now examine, ſeeing it is too well known, that many Abuſes were crept into the *Church* ſooner than their days; the one flouriſhing in the end of the Fourth Century, the other in the Fifth. I ſee no cauſe why any man ſhould ſtand amazed at the noiſe that is made againſt the *miſchief* of theſe *Impoſitions*, as he ſaith, p. 16. ſeeing all that he hath ſaid, doth not clear them from being Men's Devices in God's Worſhip, and conſequently vain Worſhip, which is a burden to any Conſcience that regardeth Chriſt's Authority more than that of Men.

Sect. 24. He pretendeth, *Sect.* 5. to give *Reaſons why the Ceremonies were retained by our Reformers, tho' they were diſtaſteful to ſome Proteſtants, and like to prove the Occaſions of future Contentions.* Theſe Reaſons are three, 1. *Out of a due reverence to Antiquity.* 2. *To juſtifie the Reformation before Enemies, in that we would not break with them for meer indifferent things.* 3. *To ſhew our conſent with the Proteſtant Churches.* To theſe I return a word or two in general, and then ſhall anſwer them particularly. 1. Why was not Scripture conſulted in this weighty matter, which wiſe men think is a ſafer and better *Rule of Reformation* than any of the Three here mentioned?

ned? Shall we ſlight or croſs Chriſt's Inſtitution in the Worſhip of God, for the ſake of *Antiquity*, or *Papiſts*, or *Proteſtants* either? I am far from thinking, that our *Reformers* had ſo little regard to *Scripture*; nay, that was the Weapon they alwaies uſed againſt the *Papiſts*, tho' in reference to the Ceremonies, they did not ſo well conſider it, as they ſhould have done. But the Dr. and his Party ſeem to lay little weight on it in this Controverſie, for he maketh little or no uſe of it through this large Book, which is ſomewhat ſtrange in a Controverſie of Divinity. It is ἀθεόλογον, to uſe weapons ſo far different from thoſe of the Apoſtles; and therefore I hope they will not prove *mighty through Chriſt*, as his were, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. None of theſe Reaſons, nor all of them in conjunction, is ſufficient to eſtabliſh any point of Truth, or to warrant any part of Divine Worſhip: Wherefore they ſhould firſt have proved the *Ceremonies* to be lawful, and then theſe three Reaſons might well have come in as *Auxiliaries* to confirm the uſe of them; but to manage the Worſhip of God by ſuch Conſiderations, without any other Reaſon was too ſlender a Ground to proceed upon.

Sect. 25. Let us now conſider his three Reaſons in particular. For the Firſt, *Due reverence to Antiquity*. *Anſ.* 1. We reverence *Antiquity* as much as our Brethren do, but with theſe two Cautions; 1. That we preferr the *firſt Antiquity* to that which was later; the *Apoſtolick Church*, to the Ages of the *Church* that ſucceeded. If they can ſhew us any footſteps of the *Ceremonies* in that *Church*, we ſhall embrace them, if not, give us leave to reject them, even out of *Reverence to Antiquity*. 2. We do not own *Antiquity*, (where there was no *Infallibility*, as was in the Apoſtles) for the Rule of our Faith or Worſhip. We know, the Church may erre, and did very ſoon begin to decline; of which ſomewhat before, and more afterward. We reverence *Antiquity* ſo far, as not to recede from it without ſufficient warrant from Scripture or clear Reaſon; and to reverence it further, is to idolize it, and put it in the place of Divine Authority. *Anſ.* 2. Why are not our Brethren uniform in their *Reverence to Antiquity?* Do not they deſert *Antiquity* in more things, and thoſe of more moment than the *controverted Ceremonies* are? Will they deny the *nævi patrum* that Divines, both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants*, have obſerved? They have laid aſide the *oſculum*, that then was called *pacis, ſanctum, vel fraternitatis*, uſed preſently after Prayer, which *Tertullian* calleth *Signaculum orationis*; the *Agapæ*, that, notwithſtanding of the Apoſtles check, 1 *Cor.* 11. 21, 22. were uſed in *Tertullian*'s time, ſometimes

times before the Lord's Supper, ſometimes after; alſo the *Baptizing* (if not only, yet more ordinarily) *the day before Eaſter and Pentecoſt*; the *Trina immerſio*; the *Communio Infantum*; the *Guſtatio mellis & lactis*, all uſed in *Baptiſm* in *Tertullian*'s time. Of the ſame ſort are the *diluting of the Wine with Water*, in the Lord's Supper; the ſign of the Croſs uſed in *Omni converſatione*, as *Tertullian* hath it; The *carrying the Eulogias, or conſecrated Symbols, to the Sick and others*; all theſe in the Second Century. In the Third Century were brought in *Offerings* and *Prayers for the Dead*, and *Exorciſm in Baptiſm*. What a world of Ceremonies were added in the Fourth Century, is too well known. Now, all theſe were as ancient as the Times of the firſt Chriſtian Emperors, to which the Dr. ſaith, p. 17. that *Our Reformers endeavoured to reduce the ſtate of the* Church; if it was thought fit, and no diſreſpect to the *Fathers*, to reject their practices in ſome things as innocent as our Ceremonies, why not in them alſo, there being no more warant in the Word for the one ſort of things than the other? This is to make *Reſpect to Antiquity* to ſerve a turn, or mens own deſigns; which I hope our worthy Reformers were far from, whatever may be ſaid of their Succeſſors.

Sect. 26. *Anſ.* 3. If the Dr. had pleaſed to tell us how ancient the Ceremonies that he contendeth for are, we ſhould have conſidered his Allegations; I am ſure he cannot equal them in *Antiquity*, with the Rites above-mentioned, which yet his Church rejecteth. We affirm them to be *Novel Inventions*, brought in under a conſiderable, tho' not the higheſt, Degeneracy of the *Church*; when we meet with his proofs to the contrary, they ſhall be anſwered. I wonder to hear from ſuch an *Antiquary* as Dr. *Stillingfleet*, That *purging out of theſe Ceremonies is a Reforming* 1600 *years backward*; as if all the *controverted Ceremonies*, or any of them, had been in the firſt Century, in the very daies of the Apoſtles; I ſuppoſe he will find it a hard Task to prove this. By what hath been ſaid, it is eaſie to diſcover the weakneſs of what he alledgeth about *giving unſpeakable Advantage to the Papiſts, by reforming* 1600 *years backward*; for neither do we own the *Ceremonies* to be ſo old; nor could *Papiſts* have any advantage, if we reject what is unwarranted by the Word, however ancient it be. Indeed, if we ſhould part with Scripture, and referr the deciſion of our Controverſies with the Papiſts only to *hurch-Hiſtory*, it were to give them advantage, if we ſhould diſown any thing ſo ancient, but I hope the Dr. will not

adviſe us to that courſe, and therefore there is no hazard. It addeth to this *unſpeakable advantage* in the Dr's Opinion, That when they (the *Non-conformiſts*) are pinched with a Teſtimony of *Antiquity*, preſently cry out of the Myſtery of *Iniquity* already working in the Apoſtle's Times, as tho' every thing that they diſliked were a part of it. *Anſ.* Tho' we have hitherto met with none of his *pinching Arguments* from *Antiquity*, yet we think that Allegation no ſuch ridiculous Evaſion as he would make it, ſeeing the Spirit of God was pleaſed to give us this warning; and after-Ages gave a clear proof of the fulfilling of this Scripture, by the ripening of thoſe Inclinations that were among ſome in the Apoſtles days, of *falling back to beggarly Elements*, *Gal.* 4. 9. and *ſubjecting themſelves to mens Ordinances: touch not, taſte not, handle not*, Col. 2. 20, 21. into the higheſt of Superſtition and Depravation of the Worſhip of God, as *Antichriſtianiſm* came to a height. If the load of humane Traditions were a part of that *Myſtery of Iniquity* that was adult under *Antichriſt*, why ſhould we not think that theſe Beginnings were a part of theſe firſt workings of it, that the Apoſtle complaineth of? If we make any thing that diſliketh us, a part of that working *Myſtery of Iniquity*, that we cannot prove to be evil, and to have had its Riſe in the decay of the Church, let us bear the blame. He ſaith, the rejecting of the Ceremonies gave a great check to the Reformation in *France*, and citeth for it *Thuanus* and *Baldninus*, both *Papiſts*, without pointing to their words, or places where they may be found; wherefore I look on what he ſaith as *gratis dictum*: And if it were true, it ſaith no more, but that there were two in *France*, that were fond of humane Ceremonies, as there are many in *England*. We have cauſe to bleſs the Lord, that the Reformation in *France* was not checked, but made very glorious Progreſs, was owned by many, great and ſmall, was ſealed with the Blood of many Martyrs. And that it was not univerſally received, we may rationally impute to the ſupreme Power being againſt it, which uſeth to have the Command of the Conſciences of the greateſt and carnal part of the world: But what the Dr. ſaith in proſecuting this reaſon, I wiſh he would reconcile with his Third Reaſon, That *England* retained the Ceremonies, to *ſhew their conſent with other Proteſtant Churches.*

Sect. 27. His Second Reaſon is, *to manifeſt the Juſtice of the Reformation, by letting Enemies ſee, that we did not break Communion with them for meer indifferent things.* *Anſ.* 1. *Papiſts* might have ſeen

ſeen that, if they would have opened their Eyes, without our retaining any of their *Ceremonies*; (to wit) That we brake with them on weighty points of *Hereſie* and *Idolatry*, and not for *Ceremonies* alone. *Anſ.* 2. When we had ſeparated from their *Church*, on ſuch *weighty Accounts*, we were not to retain any thing that they had corrupted the Worſhip of God by, to pleaſe them; neither could we retain thoſe to ſhun breaking with them, having already broken with them on other accounts. *Anſ.* 3. The Dr. taketh it for granted, which is the τὸ ζητούμενον, the Queſtion between him and us, (to wit) That *the Ceremonies are meer indifferent things.* If he prove this, he muſt carry the day. What Advantage the *Popiſh Biſhops* (for all their Subtilty and Learning that he talketh of) could have made of rejecting of theſe as well as the reſt of humane Ceremonies, I know not; they had a large Field to expatiate in with the People, by holding forth to them: How many Uſages of the ancient Church the Reformers had rejected, that were (in the Dr's ſence) *meer indifferent things*, as *Holy Water*, *Cream*, *Salt*, *Spittle*, *&c.* How little addition could the rejecting the *Croſs*, *Surplice*, *&c.* with the reſt, have made to their ſtrength? What he citeth out of *P. Martyr*, is abundantly anſwered *Sect.* 10. for he ſpeaketh not of Veſtments uſed in, but out of Worſhip, about which, he would not have ſuch Contentions made at ſuch a time, but have them removed afterward. The Dr. citeth his words Indefinitely, *Other Reformed Churches*; but the Author's words are, *Per multas Eccleſias non ab evangelio alienas.* I ſuppoſe he meaneth the *Lutheran*, or rather the *Greek Churches*; for *P. Martyr* well knew, That in the reſt of the *Reformed Churches* no ſuch Veſtments were uſed.

Sect. 28. Let us now hear his Third Reaſon, *to ſhew their conſent with other Proteſtant Churches*; and he inſtanceth in the *Lutheran* Church. *Anſ.* 1. This Reaſon could not be uſed by the Engliſh Reformers, becauſe they would ſurely rather have imitated the *Calviniſt Churches*, with whom they agreed in Doctrine, than the *Lutheran Churches*, from whom they differ'd in conſiderable points of *Doctrine*; if they had deſigned to ſymbolize with other Churches, and had been influenced in their determination of this matter by that deſign, ſure they would have ſymbolized with the *ſoundeſt Churches*. *Anſ.* 2. Neither could this Reaſon have had any weight if they had uſed it, ſeeing there were more *Proteſtant Churches* of a contrary Practice; and therefore the *Proteſtant Churches* would have carried the rejection of the Ceremonies, whether the Votes had

been

been *ponderanda* or *numeranda*. *Anſ.* 3. If our *Reformers* had deſign'd a Conſent in Ceremonies with the *Lutheran* Churches, why did they retain theſe, and not the reſt uſed among them, which are (moſt of them) as little liable to Exception, as thoſe retained, and are not by their multitude ſuch a burden as thoſe of the *Papiſts*? I hope the Dr. when he conſidereth better, will retract this Argument; for there is no *Reformed Church* on earth, that the Church of *England* ſheweth any Conſent with in her Ceremonies. *Anſ.* 4. I have elſewhere ſhewed, from good Authority, That the *Lutheran* Churches at firſt had no humane Ceremonies, but what they now have, crept into thoſe Churches afterward, as other Evils did, which *Luther* did not authoriſe.

Sect. 29. He will not only have *Lutherans*, but the chief among the *Calviniſts*, to be of his Opinion. He citeth, *Calv. Ep. ad Sadol.* That *he was for reſtoring the Ancient Face of the Church:* His words (which I found not eaſily in that long *Ep.*) are, *Ut inſtauretur vetuſta illa eccleſiæ facies quæ primo ab hominibus indoctis & non optimis deformata & fœdata, poſtea a pontifice Romano, & ejus factione, flagitiò ſe lacerata & prope deleta eſt.* It is evident, that he is not ſpeaking of Ceremonies only, but mainly of the Doctrine of the Church, that was in Controverſie between him and the *Cardinal*: Alſo, that it is the *Apoſtolick Church* that he ſpeaketh of, whoſe Face he acknowledgeth to have been deformed before *Antichriſt* came to an height. He citeth alſo *Calvin de vera Eccleſ. Reformatione*, ch. 16. which Book I find not in the Catalogue of *Calvin*'s Works; only among his *Tractatus Theolg.* I find a *Supplex exhortatio* to the Emperour and Diet at *Spire*, *De neceſſitate reformandæ Eccleſiæ*; which I have diligently lookt into, and find no ſuch Paſſage in it, but much contending againſt Humane Ceremonies: And he apologizeth for their caſting them out, by ſhewing, *Quod nihil vel primo digito attigimus, niſiquod chriſtus pro nihilo ducit, cum fruſtra coli Deum humanis traditionibus pronunciat.* Wherefore, if *Calvin* owne *Symbolical Ceremonies* (as the Dr. alledgeth) we muſt underſtand him of thoſe of *Divine Inſtitution*, or charge him with Inconſiſtency with himſelf. *Oecolampadius* (ſaith he) *lookt on the Geſture in the Sacrament as indifferent*; ſo do we; therefore we think *Kneeling* ought not to be impoſed: And when it is ſo impoſed, it loſeth its Indifferency, having a ſhew of *Adoration* of the Bread. I have not *Bucer*'s Book, and therefore ſay nothing to the citation out of him, but that his Authority will not prove the Opinion of the *Calviniſt Churches* that we debate about.

Sect.

Sect. 31. Our Author, after this Digreſſion returneth to the *Hiſtorical part* of his diſcourſe, *Sect.* 6. He telleth us, that *in the beginning of Queen* Eliz. *Reign, the Exiles returned from abroad, with ſecret diſlike of the Ceremonies, but the Act of Conformity being paſſed, and the Uſe of the Liturgy ſtrictly enjoined, there was no Separation; ſome of them accepted of Preferment in the Church: The Biſhops ſhewed kindneſs unto them for their Zealous Preaching.* A few remarks on this, will ſerve to clear our way. 1. It ſeems the *Epiſcopal Party* had not ſuch reſpect, as was fit to the Conſciences of their diſſenting Brethren, in that they were getting Laws made, to force them to that, which they could not perſwade them to by the Goſpel: but this is the Old Spirit of that party, which ſtill createth trouble to the *Church*. 2. That ſome of them accepted of Preferment (and theſe he nameth; *Gilby, Whittingham*, are among them, whom *Fuller* placeth in the Ranck of *fierce Non-conformiſts*,) ſheweth how loath they were to divide from their Brethren, as long as they were ſuffered to keep their Conſciences undefiled. 3. He omitteth to tell us, that theſe men would never ſubſcribe to the *Liturgy*, nor uſe the *Ceremonies*; which Mr. *Fuller*, *Lib.* 9. *p.* 76. informeth us of, that *not only theſe fiery men* (as he calleth them) *but even the moderate Non-conformiſts, as Mr.* Fox, *Mr.* Lawrence Humfrey, refuſed to ſubſcribe. 4. It was a commendable piece of Moderation in the then Biſhops, that they ſuffered theſe Men to Preach; notwithſtanding of their *Non-conformity*. Indeed there was cauſe for it; they were able and uſeful men, and the Church had much need of their Labours: *Fuller* ſaith, p. 65. *Tolerability was Eminency in that Age. A Ruſh Candle ſeemed a Torch, where no brighter Light was ſeen before*; where he telleth us of a Sheriff's Preaching for want of other to do that work, and how ſorrily he performed it. If the preſent Biſhops would exerciſe the ſame moderation, they needed not to be afraid of *Separation*.

Sect. 31. He proceedeth to tell us, that theſe *Non-conformiſt Preachers firſt let fall their diſlike of Ceremonies, and gaining Ground, they called them the Livery of Antichriſt, and enflamed the People, and this was the firſt Occaſion of preſſing Uniformity with Rigor: Some were ſilenced; as kindneſs had made them Preſumptuous, this made them Clamorous.* Mr. *Fuller* giveth another account of this matter, p. 76. *The Engliſh Biſhops conceiving themſelves Impowered, by their Canons, began to ſhew their Authority, in urging the Clergy of their Dioceſs, to ſubſcribe to the Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Diſcipline of the Church, and*

and such as refused the same, were Branded with the Odious Name of Puritans; and p. 81. He sheweth how *Ministers* were contented, before *B. Grindal* (one of the most moderate, but pressed to Rigor by the rest) who asked them, have we not a Godly *Princess*, *speak, is she Evil?* A Question fitter for the *Inquisitors* in *Spain*, than a Protestant Bishop. That the *Non-conformists* preached against the Ceremonies, is neither to be doubted nor wondered at; so did our Lord and Master, and his Apostle *Paul*: It was their duty to teach people to observe all that Christ hath Commanded, that being their Commission; if they spake Falshood, or Truth in an undue manner, they were liable to Correction. What our Author calleth inflaming the People, others will call faithful warning of them, against what might displease God, and defile their Consciences. Any who enflameth them to unsober, or unpeaceable principles or practices, let them bear their blame. I see nothing in their Carriage, under the Bishops forbearing of them, that deserveth the Name of presumption, nor under their Sufferings, that should be called *Clamorousness, as the Dr. calleth their informing their Friends at* Geneva, *how they were used.* But it is the Spirit of that party to use cruel Severity against them, that differ from them, and reproach them, if they say they feel it: *Patience* and *Stoical Apathy* are not the same thing. There is nothing yet said by the Dr. that can cast the Blame of Separation on the *Non-conformists*, or free the Bishops of it.

Sect. 32. He saith further, p. 19. at the end; *About this time the dissenting Party being exasperated, by silencing some of their most Zealous Preachers, began to have separate Meetings, where they Preached and Prayed, and had the Sacraments.* Here we have out of the Mouth of an Adversary, the true Cause and Original of the Separation, tho' somewhat unfavourably represented; the cause of it was, they could not have Gods Ordinances, without Mans Inventions, their Ministers being silenced, who administred them purely; and tho', but some of them at first were silenced, yet the rest were under the same Condemnation by the Law, and daily expected the Execution of the Law on them; and all the People could neither have the ordinances by those that were as yet unsilenced, nor could they live without them: So that it was not Exasperation, but desire to wait on God in his own Ordinances, that made them take that course. This account of it themselves give (as the Dr. hath it, p. 20. before the Bishop of *London*, whose Discourse to them the

Dr.

Dr. relateth, unbecoming the Moderation of B. *Grindal*, charging them with *lying pretences*, without any Ground mentioned, and unbecoming the Learning of a *Biſhop*, charging them with Condemning the *Reformation*.

Sect. 33. The next thing he inſiſteth on, is, *Beza*'s advice to the Miniſters and people; who, tho' he ſheweth his diſlike of the *Ceremonies*, and adviſeth the Miniſters not to ſubſcribe; yet preſſeth the ſilenced Miniſters not to Exerciſe their Function againſt the will of the *Queen*, and the *Biſhops*: And the People to wait on the Word and Sacraments; notwithſtanding of the *Ceremonies*; that they might by theſe means obtain a through *Reformation*: And to Miniſters, he ſaith, that they ſhould not leave their Functions for the Sake of the *Ceremonies*. In which Advice the Dr. doth much inſult. How impartially *Beza*'s opinion in this caſe is repreſented by the Dr. I know not, not being able at preſent to get a ſight of the Book; but ſome other Citations already examined, make me jealous; eſpecially, ſeeing the Dr. maketh *Beza* contradict himſelf; for p. 21. he maketh him adviſe the ſilenced Miniſters to live privately, and not exerciſe their Functions againſt the Will of the Q. and the Biſhops. But p. 22. he maketh *Beza* ſay to them, that the *Ceremonies* are not of that moment, that they ſhould leave their Functions for the ſake of them. But whatever were *Beza*'s opinion, *Non-conformiſts* of old and late, took the Word of God, and not the Authority of Men, for the Rule of their Faith and Practice: They honour ſuch as *Beza*, and are ready to receive Inſtruction from them; but muſt have leave to examine all by Scripture, as the *Bereans* did the Doctrine even of *Paul*. Again, *Beza* is far from adviſing Miniſters to forbear Preaching a together, becauſe reſtrain'd by the Magiſtrate: That principle never obtained among Proteſtant Divines; and is to be examined afterward; but he diſliked their publick appearance in that caſe, which may be conſtructed a Defiance and Contempt of the Magiſtrate. For they had hired a Hall in *London* (as publick as any *Church*) for their Meetings. Chriſt's Apoſtles were private, with the Doors ſhut, when they might not be publick, and ſo ſhould we; and yet not give over Preaching and Hearing when Men forbid us: We ſhould do it peaceably and inoffenſively; but do it notwithſtanding. For his Advice to the People, I cannot approve it; yet doth it not reach our Caſe; for he adviſeth to *Conformity* for the preſent, with expreſs mention of their Hope of a further *Reformation*; which we are out of all hope, that ever our

Clergy will yield to. In *Beza*'s Reſolution of a Caſe mentioned by the Dr. p. 23. I deſiderate one cauſe of *Separation* from a Church, (to wit) *Impoſing unlawful Terms of Communion*, unleſs either this be comprehended under the *right uſe of the Sacraments*, that he mentioneth; or ſuch withdrawing be not properly a *Separation*, but a being driven away.

Sect. 34. He ſaith, this Advice of *Beza*'s put *an effectual ſtop to the Separation*. I find no ſuch thing in Hiſtory, but rather the contrary. The ſame opinion he citeth of *Gaulter ep. dedicat. in homil. ad 1. Ep. ad Corinth. & Zanchie ep. lib.* 2. p. 391. where *Gualter* complains of the Lyes and Prejudices againſt the *Church of England*. I wiſh it have not been Lyes written by that party, that made him write ſo, and *Zanchie* is even for *Miniſterial Conformity*. It is an eaſie thing to gather Scraps and Sentences out of mens Writings, that repreſent them as ſpeaking what they never thought; and nothing is more ordinary with this Author, than to perſwade himſelf (at leaſt to endeavour to perſwade his Reader) that all the World are of his opinion. It is enough to us in this matter, that the Reformed Divines beyond Seas, did not uſe the *Ceremonies*, but have condemned them, and that on ſuch Grounds, as make them unlawful to be uſed, (to wit) that they are *Vain Worſhip*, *Additions to the Word of God*, *the Symbols of Popiſh Idolatry*, &c. and if notwithſtanding of all this, any of them would perſwade us to uſe them; their *Doctrine* doth hinder us to obey their *advice*, which we look on as an overlaſh of Charity to the then good *Biſhops* of *England*, who were Labouring to *Reform* the *Church* from *Popery*.

Sect. 35. He telleth us next, *Sect.* 7. of a *New Generation of fiercer Non-conformiſts*, the peaceable ones being worn out. It is not unuſual for Adverſaries to repreſent *true Zeal* as *fierceneſs*; but if there was undue forwardneſs among them, we defend not the Faults of Men, but the Truth of God, which they owned. There was a *ſinful fierceneſs* among ſome of Chriſt's Diſciples, when they called *for Fire from Heaven*, Luke 9. 54, 55. but this was no Argument againſt their cauſe. We, with ſad Hearts behold the *ſcandalous Fierceneſs*, that is among ſome *Antiprelatiſts* at this day, but muſt not change our Principles for that. And was there then, and is there now no *fierceneſs* on the otherſide? If we may judge of former days by the preſent, we may rationally aſcribe the *fierceneſs* of ſome of the Suffering Party, to that of the perſecuting Party, as the

Exciting

Exciting cauſe, for *oppreſſion maketh a Wiſe Man mad*, Eccleſ. 7. 7. for the Complaint that Mr. *Fox* maketh of them, which he Citeth out of *Fuller*, *Ch. Hiſt. lib.* 9. p. 106. If the Circumſtances be conſidered, it will be found not to prove what the Dr. bringeth it for. We muſt know then out of the ſame Author, that the Complaint in this Letter was againſt ſome particular men in *Magdalen* College, who were no Repreſentatives of the *Non-conformiſts*, that it was not occaſioned by any of their Principles, or Religious Practices, but by a particular injury done by theſe men to Mr. *Fox*, as he thought: And Mr. *Fox* was as likely to be byaſſed in the matter, in Controverſie between him and theſe men he complained of, as they were: The Matter was, his Son *Samuel* had left the College, and gone beyond Sea, without leave either of his Father, or the College; and at his return was ſuſpected of *Popery*; and for this, he was by that party, that Mr. *Fox* is ſo angry with, expelled the College. Beſide all this, any who readeth that Letter of Mr. *Fox*'s, may ſee a Strain, and meet with Expreſſions very unbecoming Old, Reverend and Good Mr. *Fox*, who had always profeſſed himſelf a *Non-conformiſt*; tho he had more Latitude about the uſe of the *Ceremonies*, than ſome others had: *Factioſa iſta puritanorum capita*; *iſti ter puri puritani*, and ſome other foul Reflections, with the odious name that Enemies gave to that Party, are very unſavory from ſuch a Pen: But Age and ſuppoſed Injury, muſt bear the blame of the peeviſh ſtrain, that is too manifeſt throughout that whole Letter. It were a hard caſe, if the faults either real or ſuppoſed of ſome, were always to be charged on all the Party: The Dr's own Party would be black enough, if they were thus dealt with; and even the Hiſtorian, no Friend to the *Non-conformiſts*, calls this Letter ſuch a Strain of Rhetorick, as once *Tully* uſed, *pro Domo ſua*; and imputeth the too much paſſion in it to the unjuſt Affront offered to him.

Sect. 36. Next the Dr. doth highly reſent the *Admonitions*, Firſt and Second, preſented in the Name of the *Non-conformiſts* to the Parliament, by Mr. *Thomas Cartwright*: But I ſee not by what he citeth out of theſe *Admonitions*, wherein the bitter Zeal of that Party appeared: Neither that they deſpiſed *the old Trifling Controverſy about Garments and Ceremonies*; for theſe were ſtill the Grounds of their *Non-conformity*; tho they complained alſo of other Grievances. Neither do I find that they ſaid all was out of Courſe in the *Church*; they owned the Proteſtant Religion; but

desired, that the *Reformation* might be more through, by laying aside some of the Remainders of *Popish Superstitions*, formerly overlookt. I wonder why the Dr. should startle so much at their complaining of the *Liturgy*, *Bishops*, and *Arch-bishops*, *the Way of calling their Clergy*, *the Ceremonies annexed to the Sacraments*; which are the Grievances by these *Admonitions* laid before the *Parliament*, with an humble Petition for redressing of them. Seeing he knoweth, that these are the very things that our Controversie is Conversant about; and, tho' all these be not the Grounds of our withdrawing from their Worship, yet all of them are such things as we are grieved with, and desire a *Reformation* of. That he calleth them *bold and groundless Assertions*, is a more bold and groundless Assertion than any of them; for, he knoweth, Grounds have been given; which it were better to refute, than rail at. It is also strange, that he saith, That these *Admonitions* gave the true occasion to the following Practice of *Separation*; when himself assigneth another Cause of it before this, *p.* 18, 19. and yet another that he dateth it from, long after, (to wit) the *Indulgence*, *Præf.* p. 23. Sometimes he layeth it on the *Jesuits*, *Præf.* p. 11. and indeed, he knoweth not where to lay it, missing the true Cause, which is *Episcopal Rigour* in their unscriptural *Impositions*, on the one hand; and Consciencious Obedience to the Word of God on the other. That this Cause was maintained *with greater Heat than Learning*, is the Dr's Dialect, not seldom occurring. That they *courted the Vulgar most*, is like some others of his Representations; if they did, they acted not wisely: But if the *Vulgar* embraced Truth, while it was rejected by the great ones, it is no new thing, such Ratiocinations did better become the *Pharisees*, *Jo.* 7. 48, 49. than this Reverend Author. That *they pleaded the Peoples Right of Election of their Pastors*, we own our selves their Successors in that. Speaking (*railing* we approve not) *against the Greatness and Pomp of the* Clergy, *is no popular Theme*, but hath been insisted on by sober and learned men of all Perswasions. But, that doth not much move us; we are content that they enjoy their Pomp and Greatness, if they will let us enjoy the Worship of God in purity and peace. That this will inferr a Principle of Levelling in Mens Temporal Estates, is an insinuation unworthy of this Reverend Author.

Sect. 37. He still exposeth the People, *p.* 26. as *pleased, to think what a share they should have in the new Seigniory*, to wit, *Presbytery in every Parish*. If any had such Designs in being for that way, we

blame

blame their Intent, not their Work or Opinion. But might not we (if we were ſo diſpoſed) harangue of the pleaſure the Clergy taketh in their way, in contemplation of the *fat Rectories*, *Prebendaries*, *Deaneries*, and *Biſhopricks* that they daily have in view? but ſuch ways of Reaſoning, I reckon fitter for the vulgar, whom he ſo much deſpiſeth, than for Scholars. He telleth of a *mighty Intereſt they got among the people*, and compareth this prevalency with that of the *Anabaptiſts* in *Germany*. What if we ſhould compare the prevaleſcency of *Epiſcopacy* among the Clergy and others, with that of *Popery* in *Rome*, and elſewhere, Arguments one as ſtrong as another? That *others would refine on us, as we refine on the Church*, is a Plea againſt us, that would well ſuit, and hath been often uſed by Papiſts, againſt our deſerting them. If others do that which is wrong, becauſe we do what is right, we are not accountable for that. If he can make it appear, that our Principles lead to other mens evil practices, we ſhall diſown ſuch Principles. I know not what Name to give his Aſſertion, that the conſequence (to wit, the *Browniſt Separation*) ſeemed ſo unnatural from their own (the *Presbyterian*'s) Principles; for nothing can be more raſhly or falſly ſpoken. It behoved the Dr. to attempt the proof of this, not barely to aſſert what is ſo injurious to his Brethren, and that he might well know that they would be far from owning. All that we have from him as a Colour of Proof, is a moſt unfair repreſentation of what the *Non-conformiſts* had ſaid, That the Church had *neither right Miniſtry, nor right Government, nor right Sacraments, nor right Diſcipline*. One would think that they had aſſerted the *Nullity* of all theſe; whereas they had never d ſowned the *Miniſtry* nor *Sacraments*, but found ſome faults adhering to them, as the Office of *Biſhops*, and *way of calling all the Clergy*; and as to the Ceremonies that were annexed to the Sacraments, which faults do not inferr a neceſſity of Separation, further than the owning of them is made the *Terms of Communion* with the *Church*: And it is known that Separatiſts went on other Principles, even ſuch as will divide any Church, the moſt moderate and indulgent, that is not of their way. Of which after.

SECT.

desired, that the *Reformation* might be more through, by laying aside some of the Remainders of *Popish Superstitions*, formerly overlookt. I wonder why the Dr. should startle so much at their complaining of the *Liturgy*, *Bishops*, and *Arch-bishops*, *the Way of calling their Clergy*, *the Ceremonies annexed to the Sacraments*; which are the Grievances by these *Admonitions* laid before the *Parliament*, with an humble Petition for redressing of them. Seeing he knoweth, that these are the very things that our Controversie is Conversant about; and, tho' all these be not the Grounds of our withdrawing from their Worship, yet all of them are such things as we are grieved with, and desire a *Reformation* of. That he calleth them *bold and groundless Assertions*, is a more bold and groundless Assertion than any of them; for, he knoweth, Grounds have been given; which it were better to refute, than rail at. It is also strange, that he saith, That these *Admonitions* gave the true occasion to the following Practice of *Separation*; when himself assigneth another Cause of it before this, *p.* 18, 19. and yet another that he dateth it from, long after, (to wit) the *Indulgence*, *Præf.* p. 23. Sometimes he layeth it on the *Jesuits*, *Præf.* p. 11. and indeed, he knoweth not where to lay it, missing the true Cause, which is *Episcopal Rigour* in their unscriptural *Impositions*, on the one hand; and Conscientious Obedience to the Word of God on the other. That this Cause was maintained *with greater Heat than Learning*, is the Dr's Dialect, not seldom occurring. That they *courted the Vulgar most*, is like some others of his Representations; if they did, they acted not wisely: But if the *Vulgar* embraced Truth, while it was rejected by the great ones, it is no new thing, such Ratiocinations did better become the *Pharisees*, *Jo.* 7. 48, 49. than this Reverend Author. That *they pleaded the Peoples Right of Election of their Pastors*, we own our selves their Successors in that. Speaking (*railing* we approve not) *against the Greatness and Pomp of the* Clergy, *is no popular Theme*, but hath been insisted on by sober and learned men of all Perswasions. But, that doth not much move us; we are content that they enjoy their Pomp and Greatness, if they will let us enjoy the Worship of God in purity and peace. That this will inferr a Principle of Levelling in Mens Temporal Estates, is an insinuation unworthy of this Reverend Author.

Sect. 37. He still exposeth the People, *p.* 26. as *pleased, to think what a share they should have in the new Seigniory*, to wit, *Presbytery in every Parish*. If any had such Designs in being for that way, we blame

blame their Intent, not their Work or Opinion. But might not we (if we were ſo diſpoſed) harangue of the pleaſure the Clergy taketh in their way, in contemplation of the *fat Rectories*, *Prebendaries*, *Deaneries*, and *Biſhopricks* that they daily have in view? but ſuch ways of Reaſoning, I reckon fitter for the vulgar, whom he ſo much deſpiſeth, than for Scholars. He telleth of a *mighty Intereſt they got among the people*, and compareth this prevalency with that of the *Anabaptiſts* in *Germany*. What if we ſhould compare the prevaleſcency of *Epiſcopacy* among the Clergy and others, with that of *Popery* in *Rome*, and elſewhere, Arguments one as ſtrong as another? That *others would refine on us, as we refine on the Church*, is a Plea againſt us, that would well ſuit, and hath been often uſed by Papiſts, againſt our deſerting them. If others do that which is wrong, becauſe we do what is right, we are not accountable for that. If he can make it appear, that our Principles lead to other mens evil practices, we ſhall diſown ſuch Principles. I know not what Name to give his Aſſertion, that the conſequence (to wit, the *Browniſt Separation*) ſeemed ſo unnatural from their own (the *Presbyterian's*) Principles; for nothing can be more raſhly or falſly ſpoken. It behoved the Dr. to attempt the proof of this, not barely to aſſert what is ſo injurious to his Brethren, and that he might well know that they would be far from owning. All that we have from him as a Colour of Proof, is a moſt unfair repreſentation of what the *Non-conformiſts* had ſaid, That the Church had *neither right Miniſtry*, *nor right Government*, *nor right Sacraments*, *nor right Diſcipline*. One would think that they had aſſerted the *Nullity* of all theſe; whereas they had never d ſowned the *Miniſtry* nor *Sacraments*, but found ſome faults adhering to them, as the Office of *Biſhops*, and *way of calling all the Clergy*; and as to the Ceremonies that were annexed to the Sacraments, which faults do not inferr a neceſſity of Separation, further than the owning of them is made the *Terms of Communion* with the *Church*: And it is known that Separatiſts went on other Principles, even ſuch as will divide any Church, the moſt moderate and indulgent, that is not of their way. Of which after.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Of the First Separations that were in the Church of England *after the Reformation.*

HAving followed the Reverend and Learned Dr. through his *Historical Labyrinth*, about the Non-entity of *Separation* from the *Church* by the first *Non-conformists*, and found how little Truth or Candour there is in his Account of these Matters, and how little that little Truth, that is in his Histories, doth make against our Cause; I shall now attend him in his *Historical Collections*, to prove, That when Separation began, it was vehemently opposed by the *Non-conformists*, who were dissatisfied with many Corruptions in the Church. By the *Non-conformists*, who opposed the Separation, he cannot mean all the *Non-conformists*, the *Separatists* themselves being also such; but that among the *Non-conformists* some were for Separation from the Church, and others opposed it. And so it is at this day; some are dissatisfied with humane Inventions in the Worship of God, and yet have more Freedom than some others of their Brethren have to use them.

Sect. 2. But before I come to a particular examination of his Discourse, I shall premise some things, that partly might excuse my whole Labour in this matter, and partly may render it more easie, and expedite. The first thing that I premise, is, That if I should grant all that the Dr. discourseth, from p. 27. to 29. the end of his First Part, it would conclude nothing against our Cause, for it amounteth only to this; That some good men were not of our Opinion, nor practised as we do, but used the Ceremonies, tho' they were dissatisfied with them. If Arguments from the Authority of Men could satisfie our Consciences, we should not be *Non-conformists*; for the Hinge of the Debate between us and our *conforming* Brethren, is, Whether God ought to be worshipped according to the Prescript of His own Word, and that in all the parts of His Worship, greater and lesser; or, may in some of them be worshipped by the *Traditions of Men*. We expect Divine Authority for every thing whereby we worship God, and cannot rest on that of Men. And therefore, if the Dr. could prove, That all men that ever were (who were not infallibly guided) did worship God by

Hu-

Humane Traditions, this cannot warrant us to do ſo. And yet this doth not inferr *Self-will*, or *pretending to be wiſer, or more conſciencious than all men*; yea, or any men; (an Objection frequent in our Brethrens Mouths, and more frequent with Papiſts againſt Proteſtants) for it is not Will, but Conſcience, guided by Scripture-light, that we are determined by: And we are alwaies ready to receive Light from the Word, if our Antagoniſts can hold it forth to us, tho' it were to the changing both of our Opinion and Practice: And we judge no Man's Light nor Practice; they ſtand and fall to their own Maſter; *let every one be fully perſwaded in his own Mind*: But we dare not be ſo far the *ſervants of Men*, as to ſubject our Light and Conſcience to them. If we may retort without offence, It ſeemeth to us a leſs fault (if it be any) to ſeem wiſer than thoſe that have gone before us, (if differing from them import ſo much) than it is in our Brethren to ſeem wiſer than Chriſt and his Apoſtles; from them they do manifeſtly and confeſſedly differ, in the things we now controvert about.

Sect. 3. Another general Conſideration that I premiſe, is, That there are ſuch conſiderable Differences between the old *Church of England*, in which theſe *Non-conformiſts* lived, and this new Edition of it, who now require *Conformity* from us, that their Example cannot, in reaſon, be judged ſufficient to oblige us; even Apoſtolick Example, in ſome caſes, is not declarative of what is our duty, as it is in other caſes: Beſide that, the Clergy of *England* then were ſound and orthodox, and the Doctrine of the Pulpits and Preſs was fully conſonant to the Doctrine of the Church, contained in their *confeſſion of Faith*, the 39 *Articles*. Now, it is far otherwiſe with the greateſt part, (I am far from charging all with this blame); who knoweth not how frequent (yea, almoſt univerſal) *Arminian* Doctrine is? How ſome of them preach and print *Socinianiſm*, and without a check from the Church? and, How many Popiſh Doctrines are either maintained or extenuated by ſome, is too well known by them who converſe in *England*. In the Old Church of *England*, pious men were cheriſhed: In This, we know how not only *Diſſenters*, tho' never ſo ſober and religious, are perſecuted to their utter undoing: But men of their own way, who are ſober and ſerious, are by the *High-Church-men* diſcountenanced and ſlighted, under the nick-name of *Whigs* or *Trimmers*. So that, if we judge of the Church of *England* by her *Confeſſion of Faith*, and the Temper of her ancient Clergy; the *Presbyterians*, with a few of the *Con-*

for-

formists, do best deserve that Name. But this, tho' it be our great grievance and discouragement from Communion with the Church, is none of our Grounds for withdrawing from her publick Administrations.

Sect. 4. I say then further, as I did of the *Church* in King *Edward* 6's time, That Church was a reforming Church; even in the beginning of Queen *Eliz.* Reign, they were about purging out of the old Leaven; and therefore many good men, who were dissatisfied with *Humane Trash* in the *Church*, yet cleaved to publick Ordinances notwithstanding, till a better Season should appear for purging it out (tho' I think they did better who stood at a greater distance from these Relicks of *Superstition.*) But we are out of expectation of *Reforming* of these things: What Attempts have been made by Arch-bishop *Laud*, Bishop *Cozens*, and others, to re-introduce some of the ejected Ceremonies, is not unknown; and what superstitious Gestures and Practices are used by many without Approbation of Superiours, which yet are not imposed, but are at present a sort of *candidate Ceremonies*, and stand in the place of the *Competentes* or *Catechumeni*, waiting for a fit Season to be brought into necessary and universal observation, none is ignorant, who know any thing of *English* Affairs. The Advances that the present *Church of England* hath made toward Popery, not in these things only, but in greater matters, cannot be obscured by any thing that the Dr. hath said against the Book written to that purpose; of which before. If our Ancestors bare with these *Fopperies* when they had Hope to get them removed, as other things of the same kind had been a little before, it doth not follow, that we should comply with them, when we see them like to grow upon us; yea, when we see them made use of, as an Engine to drive away the best Protestants, that Popery may the more easily re-enter.

Sect. 5. Another *Difference* between our Case and that of *Nonconformists*, in former times, is, We have been in full and quiet possession of the pure Ordinances of God, without the mixture of mens Inventions, as they never were: Therefore their using of Ceremonies was only not going forward, but our doing so were going backward. Sure it was not so great a Fault in the People of *Israel*, to be slow to entertain *Moses*, proposing a Deliverance to them out of *Ægypt*, as to talk of returning back thither: Nor in *Lot*, to linger in *Sodom*, as in his Wife to *look back* toward it. I hope these Comparisons may be pardoned, not being intended to equal the

Evils

Evils to be ſhunned, but to illuſtrate the greater Evil of Back-ſliding, than that of Continuing in a thing that is amiſs; *Licet magna componere parvis.* If any Objection be made againſt the way that we came into that Poſſeſſion, I ſhall not diſpute the Truth of that Allegation; but the thing being our due, by *Goſpel*-Right, we were to *ſtand faſt in the Liberty wherewith Chriſt had made us free*, *Gal.* 5. 1. I do not know, that their freedom from Ceremonies could be defended at Man's Bar, though, I am ſure, it could at *GOD*'s Bar, and ſo can ours.

Sect. 6. A *Third Difference* is; At this time, Miniſters of ancient ſtanding, and approved uſefulneſs in the Work of the Goſpel, who had received Ordination in the way mentioned in Scripture, by *the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*; which is alſo the way of Ordination uſed in moſt *Proteſtant Churches*; muſt be re-ordained, otherwiſe they cannot be Miniſters of the *Church of England*, nor the People enjoy the benefit of their Labours: Which *Impoſition* was never heard of in the *old Church of England*, nor the Need of it ever aſſerted: *P. Martyr*, *Bucer*, and others that came from beyond Sea, had the Right Hand of Fellowſhip given them in *England*, as Miniſters of Chriſt, without that. Neither was it ever heard of, that I have met with, in any of the *Churches of the Reformation*. Therefore People then might hope to enjoy God's Ordinances from thoſe that diſpenſed them purely; which we cannot in your Church; and conſequently, we have more cauſe to ſeek them where they may be had, than our Anceſtors had. *Fourthly*, There never was in the *Proteſtant Church of* England, before our days, ſuch a number of the Lord's Harveſt-men thruſt out of his Work, for their not complying with *Humane Ceremonies* in God's Worſhip, Two Thouſand (ſome ſay more) in one day, before they were ſilenced, one, or two, or three, and that for ſome real or pretended perſonal Miſdemeanour: For, tho' there was an *Act of Uniformity* in the beginning of Queen *Eliz.* Reign, yet *Non-conformiſts* preached, and People heard them: But here ſuch a number laid aſide, and that meerly for *Non-conformity*, and the People out of all Capacity to enjoy pure Ordinances in the Church. Here was ſome more Reaſon for having the Ordinances by themſelves, than was before. And, to make this difference between our Caſe and that of our Anceſtors, more conſiderable, theſe Miniſters were ſilenced by the Church, (tho' *clave errante*) ours only by the Magiſtrate, who never pretended a Power to give or take away *Miniſterial Authority.*

thority. *Fifthly*, We are under the ſolemn Oath of God againſt *Superſtition*, (under which Head we reckon the Ceremonies) which our Anceſtors were not: And we cannot ſee how our uſing of them conſiſteth with our keeping of that Oath.

Sect. 7. A Third general Conſideration, to blunt the edge of all this Hiſtorical Diſcourſe of the Dr's, is, That the *Separation* that the *old Non-conformiſts* did ſo much oppoſe, was quite another thing than that which he can charge upon us. It is of two ſorts, that of the *Browniſts*, or *rigid Separatiſts*, who denied the Church of *England* to be a *True Church*, but held it for an *Antichriſtian* Society, and therefore not to be communicated with. And that of the *Independents*, who owned the Congregations in *England* to be *True Churches*, but thought it unlawful to join with them, becauſe of the mixture of ſcandalous Sinners with viſible Saints, that was among them. *Separation* on the firſt Ground is well refuted by the *old Non-conformiſts*; and that of the ſecond, by the *Aſſembly of Divines*, and other *Presbyterians*: Both theſe were *active ſeparation*, choſen by the *ſeparating* Parties, and that on grounds of Diſlike with the *Church*, that are indefenſible. But our *Separation* (if it may be ſo called) is paſſive; we are driven away; we ſeek the Communion of our Brethren; we are willing to bear with many things that are a Burden to us, and which we wiſh to be reformed, rather than have Separate Meetings. We own the Pariſhes of *England* as the Church of Chriſt; the *Petition for Peace* is a publick and authentick witneſs of all this; but our Brethren will have no Communion with us, unleſs we will own the Ceremonies that they, without any warrant from Scripture, impoſe on us, which we cannot do without ſinning againſt God, and wounding our Conſciences; and we can and do give good Reaſon, and Scripture-warrant, for this our Scruple. Let then any Indifferent Perſon judge, Whether it be fair dealing to condemn our not joining in the publick Worſhip of the *Church*, by the Authority of them who condemned theſe fore-mentioned Separations. But occaſion will be given to diſcourſe this Matter further; wherefore I now forbear.

Sect. 8. I hope what hath been ſaid will evince, That the Dr's following Hiſtorical Diſcourſe hath the fault called *Ignoratio elenchi*, running through the whole Texture of it, and that it doth not touch the Queſtion in hand; but I ſhall take a more particular, yet tranſient, view of it. He ſaith, *Sect.* 8. at the beginning, *The* Separation *being now begun, the Non-conformiſts ſet themſelves with*

the

the greatest vehemency against it. If the Dr. would prove any thing againſt us, he muſt ſhew, That there was no forbearing of publick Ordinances, on account of ſcrupling the *Ceremonies* by the *Non-conformiſts*, before this, the contrary of which I have ſhewed: Alſo, That it was *Separation* on that account, and no other, that they wrote againſt, the contrary of which is moſt evident. He may know, that the *Presbyterians* now do differ nothing from the *old Non-conformiſts* in this; for they have as much ſet themſelves againſt the ſame ſort of *Separation*, and can make it appear, that this is no way unſuitable to their own Principles or Practice. It ſeemeth, by what the Dr. citeth out of Mr. *Parker*, that the Separation was charged on him, as laying a Foundation for it by his Principles; juſt as it is now with us. If the *Dr.* can charge any of us with *bitterneſs* and *pride*, the two Characters given by *Parker*, to the *Separatiſts*; let the Guilty bear their blame: But I am ſure our Principles that he is angry with, import no ſuch thing; and therefore ſuch an oblique Reflection on us in general, is not Brotherly dealing. We love not to recriminate.

Sect. 9. He alledgeth, p. 28. that of the Four Reaſons publiſhed by *Barrow* and *Greenwood*, againſt the *Separation*, Three of them were taken out of the *Admonition*, given in by the *Non-conformiſts*, to the *Parliament*. He here expoſeth theſe *Non-conformiſts* that then were, as very ridiculous men, who laid down Reaſons for Separation, and yet were ſo much againſt other mens practiſing what they gave Reaſon for. If he think them ſuch men, why would he bind us to their Authority, which is the tendency of this long Diſcourſe? But the *Dr.* doth both miſtake and miſrepreſent this matter: His Miſtake is, In the *Admonition* theſe things were preſented as Grievances, to be redreſſed, not as Grounds of Separation. His Miſrepreſentation is, Theſe Monitors did not ſpeak of the Miniſtry, Government, and Worſhip, as wholly unlawful, antichriſtian, and falſe; for they owned the Miniſtry and Worſhip (whatever thoughts they had of the Government) as right for the ſubſtance, tho' vitiated by ſome Modes adhering to them, which they deſired to be removed. It is true, *Gilford* ſaith, they make a *vile Schiſm*, rending themſelves from the *Church of England*; but doth he not add, *And condemning by their Aſſertions the whole viſible Church in the World, even as the Donatiſts did of old time?* Which ſheweth, that it was not ſcrupling of *Humane Ceremonies* that they are charged with, but nullifying of Churches, becauſe of ſome Corruptions in them.

Gilford's words that follow, p. 29. we are not concerned in: We know, that many were the ſad effects of that *Separation*, diverting People from the ſerious Exerciſes of Religion, to Janglings. And it is not without this effect on ſome, where the oppreſſed Party is Innocent, as to the main; but that proveth not, that we ſhould comply with unſcriptural Ceremonies, to ſhun this Evil, but that they ſhould not be impoſed on us. As to *Gilford*'s blaming them, for not coming to the *Book-Prayers*, this he ſpake without Book, either in the heat of Diſputation, in which many do over-reach; or, it was his Opinion, but is not ours. I agree with *Gilford*, That *the Corruptions of the Church of* England *did not make her Antichriſtian*; and therefore the *Browniſts* were to be blamed in *ſeparating* from her as *Antichriſtian*; not we, who are ready to join with her as a Church of Chriſt, but cannot digeſt her *Humane Ceremonies* in Divine Worſhip. That *Gilford* was a *Non-conformiſt*, the Dr. needed not to be at ſo much pains to prove. That all *Non-conformiſts* are fallible men, and ſome of them miſtaken in ſome things, we willingly grant. We alſo cloſe with what his next Author ſaith, p. 30. That he is a Member of that *Church*, where he is by Providence placed, and that he ought not to ſeparate from it while it is a true *Church*, only with this Exception, Unleſs that *Church* require me to ſin; and if I will not do ſo, exclude me: Which Exception it could not be expected that he ſhould mention, that not belonging to the thing then controverted. It is hard for a Controverſal Writer to guard his words againſt all Exceptions that contingent Caſes, not yet thought on, may afford. The ſame is to be anſwered to his Citations out of Mr. *Bernard*, and the *Confutation of the Errours of the Separatiſts*, done in name of the *Non-conformiſts*; ſo that this whole Diſcourſe of the Doctor's is, ——ὁ δὲν πρὸς Διανύσιν.

Sect. 10. He thinketh, *Sect.* 9. to parallel our withdrawing from the *Ceremonies*, with the *Separation* of the *Browniſts*, (for if that be not deſigned, I know not what his Diſcourſe tendeth to) by ſetting down the conceſſions of theſe *Separatiſts*, (to wit) That *the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *is ſound and ſaving*; *that they will not ſeparate for every blemiſh in the Church*. So far we agree. But they pleaded (ſaith he) that the Corruptions of the *Church of England* were ſuch, as overthrew the very *Conſtitution of a Church*; in which we differ from them, as he ſaith *p.* 33. the *old Non-conformiſts* did, of whom he ſaith that they held, *That nothing could juſti-*

fie

ſie Separation from the Church, but ſuch corruptions which overthrow the Being of it. And he ſaith, *The force of all their Reaſonings againſt the Separation, lay in this, and the denying of ſuch corruptions to be in the Church.* For proving of this, he ſheweth, That the *Separatiſts* thought nothing could juſtifie their Separation, but that which *nullified* the *Church*; and it is no wonder, for they minded nothing but an active *Separation*, and not that of being driven away by ſinful *Terms of Communion* impoſed. It is true, they mention the *Service*, as one of their Pleas for Separation, but not barely as unlawful to be uſed, but as *nullifying the Church* which we never pleaded: For, what he addeth, p. 35, *&c.* that the *Non-conformiſts*, when they would *diſprove the Separation*, only proved the *Church of England* to be a True Church: It is no wonder that they minded no more, ſeeing that was to overturn the very Foundation of the adverſe Cauſe. But, Did they ever teach, that we ought to communicate with a *true Church* in thoſe parts of her Worſhip that are ſinful? which is the one half of the Controverſie that we now manage. He inſulteth much in an Aſſertion of the *Non-conformiſts*, p. 36. at the end, That *the Church of* England *is a true Church of Chriſt, and ſuch a one, as from which whoſoever wittingly and continually ſeparateth himſelf, cutteth himſelf off from Chriſt.* I might ſay as much as all this, without giving the leaſt advantage againſt our Cauſe; for we do not ſeparate our ſelves, but the Door is ſhut againſt us, by as many Bars as they have impoſed *Ceremonies*, which we cannot uſe without Sin, and they will not ſuffer us to worſhip God with them without theſe. Again, We do not continually ſeparate from the *Church*, but are ready and waiting to return to Communion with her in all Ordinances, whenever theſe ſinful Bars ſhall be removed that keep us out; the *Separatiſts* could ſay neither of theſe. That the *old Non-conformiſts* did not underſtand their Aſſertion of ſuch a Caſe as ours is, is evident; for they were men of ſo much Sence and Reaſon, as that they could not imagine it impoſſible, that any ſhould lawfully withdraw from joining with a *Church*, becauſe of ſinful *Terms of Communion* required: They could not blame any Member of the Church of *Pergamus*, to refrain from the Communion of that Church, if that Communion were denied to that Member, unleſs he would either approve of the *Doctrine of the Nicolaitans*, or at leaſt conſent to the tolerating of it. Such is our Caſe; we are denied Chriſt's Ordinances in the *Church*, unleſs we will approve, by our practice, the Ceremonies which we

judge

judge ſinful; with what Face can they blame us, for doing that which themſelves put us into ſo great a Neceſſity to do? Have we not rather cauſe to take up *David*'s complaint againſt them, 1 *Sam.* 26. 19. *They have thruſt us out from the Inheritance of the Lord, ſaying, go ſerve other Gods.* Had it been fair dealing to call *David* a *Separatiſt* in his Exile, becauſe he waited not on the Temple Service? And yet the Neceſſity that he was under, of abſtaining from it, was not ſo great as ours: That was Bodily Hazard, ours is Soul Hazard by ſinning againſt God.

Sect. 11. The *Non-conformiſts* Reaſons that he bringeth for their Aſſertion, p. 36. prove no more than what is already granted, as any that readeth and underſtandeth them, may perceive. What he bringeth out of *Jacob* againſt *Johnſon*, and *Ball* againſt *Can*, is nothing againſt us; to wit, That *the Church of* England *is a true Church.* From p. 39. He ſheweth that *Non-conformiſts* held, That the Corruptions of the *Church of* England, were not ſuch as did over-throw the Being, and Conſtitution of it, which we willingly yield to. What he Citeth out of other *Non-conformiſts*, p. 40, 41. about *Forms of Prayer*, and the *Engliſh Liturgy*, ſhall be examined in its due place; if the Lord permit. I know ſome *Non-conformiſts* have had, and ſome now have a greater freedom to uſe it than others have: But as now there are, ſo of old there were, others that could not comply with it. What ever was *Giffard*'s opinion about the *Ceremonies* being *Antichriſtian*; if he thought them Lawful to be uſed (which is our Queſtion) I know not why he ſhould be reckoned a *Non-conformiſt*: But indeed there is nothing of that, in what the Dr. Citeth, p. 41, 42. What he bringeth, p. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47. out of ſeveral *Non-conformiſts*, to ſhew that the *Miniſtry*, *Diſcipline*, and *Hierarchy* of the *Church of* England, is not *Antichriſtian*, nor the *Church-Antichriſt*; we are not concerned to diſprove, and the Dr. might have ſpared all this Tranſcribing, it being wholly beſide the queſtion. Some things he maketh them ſay, that deſerve a little Animadverſion; but I will not now Digreſs to take notice of them.

Sect. 12. He proceedeth, *Sect.* 12. To give Accompt of the *Independent Separation*, and how it was oppoſed by the *Aſſembly* of *Divines*, by ſuch reaſons as will hold againſt the preſent Separation. I confeſs there is a *preſent Separation*, that theſe Reaſons do hold againſt; for that ſame *Separation* doth ſtill continue: But he doth not prove his point, unleſs he make it appear that theſe Reaſons

ſons conclude, that we ſhould uſe the *Ceremonies*, rather than forbear *Church-Communion* with the *Prelatiſts*. But his Reaſons for what he ſaith, we ſhall attend in their courſe. What reflection the Dr. thinks to caſt on the *Non-conformiſts* by the breaking of *Brown*'s *Church* in *Middleborough*; and his jugling in the Matters of God, I know not. This long Story hath either no deſign, which I cannot impute to a Man of his Parts; or an ill deſign, which I am loth to impute to one of his Worth. However it be, we diſclaim all concern in it. There have been Breaches and Apoſtaſies among others, as well as among *Non-conformiſts*. That a nameleſs Author calleth *Brown*'s Preaching privately in time of the Publick Aſſemblies a *Curſed Conventicle*; it may be there was cauſe, if *Brown* was ſuch a bad Man, as the Dr. maketh him: But I know ſome of theſe Meetings that the Dr. is ſo diſpleaſed with, are bleſſed of the Lord. He imputeth theſe and the other Diſſentions that followed, to the Judgment of God on them; this we are no way concerned to Apologize for: Their way was Evil, and it did not proſper: If the Doctor can prove our way to be Evil, let him paſs what Judgment he will on what befalleth us, but till then, Sobriety in judging is becoming. No doubt the *Papiſts* thought they had as good cauſe to conſtrue Providence to favour them, becauſe of the *Confuſions*, and *Ruin* that followed in *Germany*, on the *Reformation*. We have Sins enough to provoke the Lord againſt us; but we are not convinced, that the Things in Controverſy are to be reckoned among them. Let the Dr. impute this to our *Obſtinacy*, at his pleaſure, we can bear it: In this we are *Murus Aheneus*----in the Poets Senſe.

Sect. 13. He telleth us, p. 53. of the preſent *Separatiſts* going beyond Mr. *Robinſon*, the Founder, (as he maketh him) of the *Independent* way, who was for Communicating with the *Church* in the Word and Prayer: He ſhould have told us who theſe are? It is true, they thruſt us out from Word and Prayer too, by denying us all *Church Privileges*, for not ſubmitting to the Impoſitions; and force us to ſeek all Gods Ordinances, where we can have them in his way; but we are far from withdrawing from the Word and Prayer in the *Church* of our own choice. This Diſcourſe againſt the *Independent Separation*, I meddle not with, and therefore paſs over all that he ſaith, from p. 53. to 59. only touching Two or Three Paſſages. What Mr. *Can* ſaith, p. 54 of the principles of the *Puritans* inferring *Separation*, is ſo far True, that their holding the unwar-

unwarrantableneſs of *Biſhops* and *Ceremonies*, doth inferr on them who act conſcientiouſly, that they ſhould rather refrain from joining with any *Church*, than own the one, or uſe the other: And if theſe be made the neceſſary *Terms of Communion* with a *Church*, we muſt ſuffer our ſelves to be *ſeparated* from ſuch Impoſers. p. 59. Some complaining of the *Miſchief* of *Impoſitions* (a Word the Dr. is very angry with) becauſe unordained men were not ſuffered to Preach, when and where they liſted, is no fit Parallel to the complaint that others make of the *Miſchief of Impoſitions*, when they are Excluded the *Church*, for not uſing *Humane Ceremonies*: In the one caſe there is reſtraint of what is contrary to Scripture; no impoſing in the other. That is impoſed to be done, which is without warrant; yea, condemned in Scripture. Such mean Artifices the Dr. reacheth at, that he may ridicule our unwillingneſs to be Impoſed on by Man's Will, in the Worſhip of God. p. 58. he ſaith, *Presbyterians would not have all left to Conſcience*: Who ever ſaid otherwiſe; or can ſay otherwiſe, unleſs they would firſt burn their Bibles? We never made *Conſcience* the *Rule*; it muſt be guided and ruled by Scripture. What he ſaith of *Popular Government*, let them anſwer it who are concerned. He ſaith, *Humorous and Factious People, will always be complaining of the Miſchief of Impoſitions*. (This Title of Mr. *A*'s Book, is a great Eye-ſore to him) but he ſhould conſider that on the other hand, an *Imperious, Superſtitious Clergy*, that will be *Lords over Gods Inheritance*, in diſpite of the Apoſtles Words, will always be *Impoſing*, and take it ill that any ſhould think their *Impoſitions* a Burden; as wiſe and ſober Men may do without being either *Humorous* or *Factious*. He ſaith, *the Principles of Liberty of Conſcience, will unavoidably lead men into Confuſion*. Many think that ſuch indiſtinct and raſh Aſſertions, are more like to lead Divines into *Confuſion*, in managing their polemick Diſcourſes. Muſt *Conſcience* then be bound Hand and Foot, and carried whither the *Prelate* pleaſeth? Will even Dr. *Stillingfleet* own Mr. *Parker*'s Notion of the *Publick Conſcience*? Hath *Conſcience* no uſe, but to diſcern what is my *Lord Biſhop*'s Will, or what the *Act of Parliament* ſaith? We are as far from owning an *unbounded Liberty of Conſcience*, as the Dr. is; but the abſolute denying of all *Liberty of Conſcience*, is liker to lead Men into *Atheiſm*, than giving them ſome *Liberty* to lead them into *Confuſion*. Let *Conſcience* then have *Liberty*, where it hath Scripture warrant for what it holdeth (which is the *Liberty* we plead for to our ſelves) and let it not be rigo-

rouſly

rouſly dealt with in things that are of leſſer Moment in Religion, where they that profeſs *Conſcience*, are otherwiſe ſober and peaceable; and there is no hazard of confuſion from *Conſcience*. It is a more innocent thing, where it is rightly dealt with, than the Dr. taketh it to be, and we think it is more to be regarded, than the Rules of Order and Government in a *Church*, which the Dr. ſeemeth to bring in Competition with it. I mean ſuch Rules as are but of mans deviſing. It is falſe, that *the Presbyterians cannot Anſwer Independants, as to the pretence of Conſcience; nor they the Anabaptiſts.* For the one can refute the other wherein they miſtake, and tell them that *Conſcience* cannot make their Error to be a Truth: And yet they can bear with Godly and Peaceable Men in theſe miſtakes, becauſe of their *Conſcience*.

Sect. 14. He telleth us, *Sect.* 14. That *the Presbyterians charged the Diſſenting Brethren, with being the occaſion of an inundation of Error, by their going upon the principle of Liberty of Conſcience.* I am far from juſtifying that *Toleration*, which the *Independants* pleaded for, and which (by their means, ſome ſay) was uſed in our late times of Diſtraction: Then there was no *King* in our *Iſrael*. All Error ſhould be oppoſed: Groſs Error puniſhed and reſtrained by force: But will it hence follow, that we muſt not have leave to Diſſent, even from thoſe things that the *Church* impoſeth, without Warrant from the Lord? *All the Citations* that the Dr. bringeth, p. 59, 60, 61. are evidently againſt a vaſt *Toleration*. The *Uniformity* in Religion, that the *Scotch-Commiſſioners* ſpeak of, is not to be underſtood of *Words in Prayers*, and *Humane Ceremonies* (for would they not then have firſt ſetled that way at home?) but of Doctrine, and Diſcipline, and Worſhip ſo far as commanded by Chriſt.

Sect. 15. The Dr. is pleaſed to give himſelf the Trouble, from p. 61. to 73. to tranſcribe the Subſtance of the many and large debates, that were between the *Aſſembly of Divines*, and the *Diſſenting Brethren*: But he will find it hard to apply the condemning of their Separation to our Caſe: For they refuſed Communion with the *Presbyterians*, whom they could not charge with requiring them to uſe any mode of Worſhip, but what was commanded: They left the *Church* for ſuppoſed Corruptions, which were none of their perſonal fault, nor were they put under a neceſſity of approving them. We are willing to have Communion with the *Church*, if we may be ſuffered but to forbear the ſeperſonal *Accuſations* that,

were our Sin, if we ſhould do them. But let us hear what concluſions the Dr. draweth from theſe Debates, p. 73, 74. The *1ſt.* is, That *the Old Non-conformiſts thought themſelves bound in Conſcience to Communicate with the Church of* England, *and did look on Separation from it as Sin, notwithſtanding its Corruptions.* This he thinketh he hath ſo proved, that the ſhining of the Sun may as eaſily be denied: Whether it hath been diſproved in what is above diſcourſed, and with what meaſure of clearneſs, let others judge; alſo how inconcludent mens Authority is in Gods matters, hath been ſhewed. The *2d.* Concluſion is, That *all Men were bound in Conſcience toward preſerving the Unity of the Church, to go ſo far as they were able: So that the lawfulneſs of Separation, where Communion is lawful, is one of the neweſt Inventions of this Age.* This concluſion I eaſily yield to: and who are the Inventers and Maintainers of the Contrary, I know not. I hope he will not blame us, when we are thruſt out of the *Church*, that we do not lie about the Church-walls; rather than go to another place, to Worſhip God by our ſelves. If we do any thing but what we can ſhew Chriſt's command for, let him blame us. *3d.* Concluſion. *Bare Scruple of Conſcience doth not juſtifie Separation, altho it may excuſe Communion in the particulars ſcrupled; provided they have uſed the beſt means for a right Information.* I do ſo fully Aſſent to this Concluſion, that I ſhall ſay more than the Dr. doth; to wit, that bare ſcruple of Conſcience, cannot excuſe even Communion in the particulars ſcrupled, whatever means have been uſed for Information: For Scruples that have no Scripture Ground (and what elſe can be meant by *bare Scruples*, I know not) make an Erring Conſcience; which however it may excuſe *a toto*, can excuſe from nothing, *in totum*. But if our Scruples, ſuch as they are, (and we may ſay, we have uſed the beſt means that we could for Information) do excuſe us from Communion in the particulars Scrupled, and if by the force of rigid Men, we be deprived of Gods Ordinances, unleſs we will communicate in theſe ſcrupled particulars; I hope the Duty that lyeth on us to worſhip God, and not live like *Atheiſts*, will ſo far warrant that which the Dr. will call *Separation*; that it will be hard for him to diſprove it, unleſs he retract this concluſion; by which he hath given a ſore Blow to his cauſe. I oppoſe to this regardleſneſs of Mens Conſciences, that the Dr. ſeemeth to allow himſelf in, the Judgment of the Excellent Judge *Hales* in his piece of *Schiſm*, who ſaith, *That nothing abſolveth from the Guilt of Schiſm, but true and unpretended*

unpretended Conſcience: Alſo, that *requiring the doing of an unlawful or ſuſpected Act, is a juſt cauſe of refuſing Communion.*

Sect. 16. Concluſion 4. *Where Occaſional Communion is lawful, conſtant Communion is a Duty.* I ſuppoſe he meaneth of that particular *Church*, in which a Man is a Member, and hath his conſtant Reſidence; otherwiſe it is manifeſtly falſe; for it is lawful for me to have Occaſional Communion with the Proteſtant *Church of France*; but that I am not conſtantly bound to Communicate in *England*, if my Occaſions call me often abroad. But take it in the moſt favourable Senſe, the Aſſertion is not true: It is lawful to have Occaſional Communion with a *Church* that hath one Ordinance pure, *Exemp. Gr. Preaching*: I may as occaſion ſerveth join in that Ordinance, but if there be nothing elſe pure, or that I can partake of without Sin, in that *Church*, I am obliged to look after another Occaſion, where I may enjoy all Gods Ordinances without ſinful additions; and having got that opportunity, I do not ſee what Obligation lieth on me *conſtantly* to hear in that *Corrupted Church*, rather than where I enjoy all the Ordinances in Purity. What he alledgeth out of the *Aſſemblies Reaſons*, againſt the *Diſſenting Brethren*, doth not all quadrate with our caſe; for the *Congregational Men* could not alledge, that any unlawful *Terms* of *Communion* were impoſed on them by the *Presbyterians*, in one Ordinance more than another; and therefore if they might join in one Ordinance, they might in all; and ſo had no excuſe from conſtant Communion, if occaſional Communion was lawful. But this queſtion about occaſional and conſtant Communion the Dr. bringeth in afterward; therefore enough of it at preſent.

Sect. 17. Concluſion 5*th*. That *withdrawing from the Communion of a true Church, and ſetting up Congregations for purer Worſhip, or under another Rule, is plain and down-right Separation, as is moſt evident from the Anſwer of the Aſſembly of Divines, to the diſſenting Brethren.* It is ſtrange that this Learned Author, ſhould Cite theſe Men for condemning our Practice, who were of the ſame Principles and Practice that we own, and he is pleading againſt, particularly Dr. *Burgeſs*, Mr. *Caſe*, Mr. *Calamy*, Mr. *Newcomen*, &c. whom he nameth. They were neither ſuch Fools as to condemn themſelves: Nor ſuch Knaves as to blame others for that, wherein they allowed themſelves. Wherefore it is evident, that it was not every *Separation* from a true *Church* that they condemned (for ſuch is both innocent, and neceſſary, when a *true Church* will impoſe ſinful *Terms*

of Communion on her Members) but a Separation for pretended Corruptions in a true *Church*, which Corruptions were not impoſed on the Separaters, either to be practiſed or approved of by them, and ſo could not become their perſonal Sin. This Separation they condemned; and that with good reaſon; for where the *Church* is a *true Church*, and no Sin committed by them that join with it in their joining, Separating can have no ſhew of Reaſon.

Sect. 18. He inferreth, *Sect.* 16. From what he had ſaid, That *the preſent Practice of Separation, cannot be juſtified by the Principles of the Old Non-conformiſts: Nor by the Doctrine of the Aſſembly of Divines.* The former I have diſproved, tho' he ſaith, *it's clear by undeniable Evidence:* The latter, he ſaith, is, in effect, confeſſed by all his Adverſaries; to make out which he citeth in the Margin, Mr. *Baxter*, and Dr. *Owen:* For the latter, no wonder he confeſs it, ſeeing he was for that very Separation, which the *Aſſembly* oppoſed. And the former is yet alive to ſpeak for himſelf: And it is as little wonder that he ſhould ſay ſo; for he denieth that any of *Aſſembly* were *Presbyterians.* I have already ſhewed that the the *Aſſembly* might well Aſſert, That Separation from a *true Church* was *Schiſmatical*; the men that they debated againſt, ſeparating or ſuch Grounds, as either proved the *Church* falſe; or gave them no colourable ground for that *Schiſm*: But they could not underſtand it without Exception. He taketh a great deal of pains, p. 75. to prove that any difference that is between our *Separation*, and that which the *Aſſembly* condemned, is but in ſome Circumſtances, that do not make the one unlawful, and the other not: But that it is otherwiſe is clear, if we conſider (as hath been ſaid) that they had no thing Impoſed on them as Duty, and as *Terms of Communion*, which had been their Perſonal Sin to do, as we have. If this make not a material, and pertinent Difference, I *know not what can do it.* But, ſaith he, *the Aſſembly uſed general Reaſons, that have equal force at all times.* *Anſ.* Theſe general reaſons may ſuffer an Exception; which they did not, nor needed not mention, becauſe it was not the caſe in hand: Nor do we make the Difference to lie between that and this time; but between their and our Grounds of *Non-communion.*

Sect. 19. He ſaith, *it cometh to the ſame point, whether the Scruples (on which men ſeparate) relate to ſome Ceremonies required, or to other Impoſitions, as to Order and Diſcipline; if they be ſuch as they*

pretend

pretend to a neceſſity of Separation. Anſ. 1. The Dr. then maketh no difference between a Scruple that hath ground for it; and one that hath none. If he can make our Scruple appear to be groundleſs, as he confeſſeth theirs to be, he hath advantage againſt us. *Anſ.* 2. Is there no difference between having probable grounds for a Scruple, and having no ſuch grounds? Is there any compariſon between ſcrupling at uſing *Religious Ceremonies*, that have no warrant in the word, but are in general, at leaſt, condemned in it, and ſtrupling at ſome pretended Corruptions, that no Scripture Condemneth? *Anſ.* 3. If the Dr's reaſoning be good, either we muſt bear with none that ſcruple, unleſs we ſcruple the ſame thing: Or we muſt bear with all that Scruple. The firſt of theſe excludeth all Chriſtian forbearance; the laſt he will not alledge. *Anſ.* 4. He mentioneth *Impoſitions as to Order and Diſcipline*, only that we may ſeem Impoſers as well as his party is; that is unreaſonable, not only becauſe we can ſhew Chriſt's Laws for our Order and Diſcipline, which he will not pretend to ſhew for the *Ceremonies*: But alſo becauſe we can bear with ſober and faithful Brethren, that cannot approve of all that we do; which his Party will not.

Sect. 20. He miſtaketh the Caſe when he inſinuateth, That *we have no more but ſcruple of Conſcience to plead.* The Dr. ſhould not have alledged this, till he, or ſome of his party had anſwered all our Reaſons of Scrupling, in many Books, neither touched by him, or any other: But now he will Knock down our cauſe with one blow. He ſaith, *he put the Caſe as clear as poſſible, to prevent all Subterfuges, and ſlight Evaſions.* He ſuppoſeth five ſcrupling Parties, *one at the Liturgy, a Second at the Croſs and Kneelling, a Third at wrong gathered Churches, a Fourth at Infant Baptiſm, a Fifth at Preaching by ſet Forms, and being ſtinted by an Hour-glaſs:* And he ſaith, *the Nature of the Caſe doth not vary according to theſe.* If this be the Dr's *Herculean Argument*, we ſhall not need to fear his Strength ſo much as before. Surely the Learned Dr's parts could let him ſee more Reaſon to bear with ſober and intelligent men, who dare not join with a *Church* in worſhipping God, by *Religious Ceremonies* not inſtituted by Chriſt, than with Fantaſtick *Quakers*, who caſt off God's Ordinances, becauſe of an Hour-glaſs; but that his prejudice doth, in this, darken his underſtanding. But the Tendency of his Diſcourſe ſeemeth to be; either Church-Authority muſt lead us Blind-fold, ſo as we muſt ſcruple nothing impoſed; or neither Scripture, nor Reaſon ſhall limit our Fancy; but

we may ſcruple what we will. He ſaith well, p. 76. (and the *Non-conformiſts* before him had ſaid it) *If they alledge Grounds to juſtifie themſelves, they muſt do it* ex natura rei, *and not from the meer errour or miſtake of Conſcience.* We will moſt willingly join iſſue with him on this Condition, provided the *natura rei* may be judged by Scripture, as all the Worſhip of God ſhould be. If he can prove the *Ceremonies* that we ſcruple, to be ſuch as we may uſe without Sin; or, if we prove not the contrary, let him call us as *vile Separatiſts* as he pleaſeth. If the Dr. had pleaſed at firſt to hang the matter on this Pin, and not to have filled his Book with ſo many Citations, to ſtrengthen his Cauſe with Humane Authority; he might have ſaved both himſelf and me all this labour, that hitherto we have been at. It is no great commendation either of the wiſdom or of the ſobriety of his Church, that he ſaith, *She hath as much occaſion* (*cauſe* he ſhould have ſaid) *to judge their* (the Presbyterians) *ſcruples unreaſonable, as they do thoſe of the Quakers.* What followeth about occaſional communion, is anſwered above. That which he citeth out of Mr. *A.* of the *Aſſemby's* being tranſported in the heat of Diſpute, is not ſo derogatory from that venerable Meeting, as he would make it: It is rare to find it otherwiſe with ſinful men. How many things did thus ſlip from the Pens of ſeveral of the *Fathers*, that the Dr. will not approve? But we do not hereby give up the Cauſe to the diſſenting Brethren, nor forſake the *Aſſemblies* Principles; it is one thing, not to approve all that men ſay, and another thing to condemn the Cauſe that they plead for.

Sect. 21. Our Author doth next undertake *Sect.* 17. to ſhew how *we have deſerted the Principles of the old Non-conformiſts, as to private Perſons reforming Church-Diſcipline, ſetting up new Churches, and the preaching of Miniſters, when ſilenced by the Laws.* For the ſetting up of *Churches* and *Diſcipline*, he citeth ſeveral *Non-conformiſts* againſt it, without the *Magiſtrate*, p. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82. To all which, I anſwer, That two things are expreſly in theſe Citations, that make what they condemned not, to reach our Caſe: For, 1. They condemn private mens endeavouring a *publick Reformation*, that belonging to the *Magiſtrate*; ſo it is thrice expreſſed, p. 81. out of *Confut. of the Browniſts*. Now we meddle not with a *publick Reformation*, otherwiſe than by our Prayers and Advice, as we have occaſion, (which is there alſo expreſly allowed by them) but content our ſelves to ſerve God privately, when we cannot do it publickly without

out Sin. To this ſame purpoſe is that which is cited out of *Giffard*, p. 79. That *tho' every one ought to keep a good Conſcience, yet no private Perſons are to take on them publick Authority to reform.* If we do ſo, blame us for it. 2. Theſe *Non-conformiſts* all along ſpeak of private Perſons reforming the Diſcipline of the Church. Now, what is done among us of that kind, is done by Miniſters, who, though in the State they are private perſons, and therefore are not to meddle with matters of that concern: Yet in the *Church* they are publick perſons, and have Authority from God, to diſpenſe his Ordinances. But I do not, by what I have ſaid, intend to homologate all that the Dr. citeth out of theſe *Non-conformiſts*; ſeveral things they aſſert, that cannot well be defended; but I ſhall not digreſs ſo far, as to particularize them.

Sect. 22. I ſhall only ſay, That had this Principle *of not reforming the Ordinances of Chriſt by People, among themſelves, till the Magiſtrate gave countenance*, taken alwaies place in the World, not only *Chriſtianity* had not come in the place of *Judaiſm*, but *Arrianiſm* had extinguiſhed the *Orthodox Profeſſion*. Have we not Examples of People who were under *Arian* Biſhops, ſetting up new Biſhops over themſelves, in *Epiphan. Hæreſ.* 73? Doth not *Hilary* exhort the People to ſeparate from *Auxentius*, their *Arian* Biſhop, *adverſus Arianos*, when yet there was no *Orthodox Magiſtrate* to countenance theſe things? Yea; had this Principle obtained, there had been no *Reformation* from *Popery*, in moſt places, where now, through the Lord's mercy, it is. Say not, that our reforming of Worſhip and Diſcipline is not in things of that moment; for tho' that be true, yet it is not of no moment; without it we ſhould either join with men in Sin, or live without the Ordinances of God. Let me here make uſe of the Teſtimony of a worthy Perſon, one whom the Dr. afterward bringeth againſt us; and therefore, in reaſon, cannot refuſe his Suffrage, (tho' we are far from hanging our Cauſe on mens Opinions, as the Dr. doth) that is, the learned *Monſieur Claude*, in his excellent Book called, the *Hiſtorical Defence of the Reformation*; the deſign of which, is, to ſhew, that every man hath a right to believe the truth, and to diſſent from Errour, and to profeſs this, and to reform Religion, by ſetting up Religious Aſſembles, for the true Worſhip of God; when they cannot have Truth, nor right Worſhip in that which goeth under the name of the Church. He ſaith, (Part 2. p. 169.) *As it is ridiculous to demand of a man, in a civil Society, what perſonal Call he had to live, to labour, to avoid that which*

would

would be hurtful to his Life, and to have a care of his own Preſervation; ſo it is alſo an Abſurdity to demand of our Fathers, what Call they had to believe aright in God, and to worſhip him purely, and to remove far from them all that which they believed to be contrary to a ſpiritual life, and their own Salvation. And much more to this purpoſe. He objecteth, p. 170. *Is not this to rend the Church by Diviſions?* and anſwereth, *No; for the Unity of the* Church *lieth not in Errour, or falſe Worſhip; it is love to the* Church, *to endeavour her cure, by ſhewing a good example.* And, *Part* 4. p. 14, 15. When it is objected, That the Proteſtants could not ſeparate, becauſe their Paſtours were againſt it; he anſwereth, *That many Paſtors went along with them; and if that had not been, they might have choſen Paſtors*; all which he diſcourſeth at length. We have an Example of ſetting up God's Ordinances without, yea, againſt the Laws of men, in the Word. It is clear from *Ezr.* 5. with *ch.* 4. 21. that the Temple was built againſt Law: And it is clear from *Hag.* 1. 2. that it was the Peoples Sin, that they neglected it ſo long, even when Law was againſt them; and that they ought to have done it before *Haggai* and *Zechariah* put them on it.

Sect. 23. Next the Dr. (p. 82.) bringeth in ſome *Non-conformiſts* condemning Miniſters Preaching, after they were ſilenced. It is evident to any that readeth, p. 82, & 83. that it is *ſilencing* by the *Church* that is there ſpoken of; but our reſtraint is by the *Magiſtrate* only, who doth not pretend to give nor to take away Paſtoral power. *Pag.* 86. he bringeth Mr. *Bradſhaw* reaſoning againſt Miniſters preaching againſt the will of the *Magiſtrate*; but in the Firſt part of Mr. *Bradſhaw*'s Diſcourſe, it is evident, that he ſpeaketh only againſt publick Preaching in ſuch a place, in defiance of the Magiſtrate, and running on the Sword's point, or oppoſing Sword to Sword; which we are far from either practiſing or approving. I confeſs, p. 87. he is for the Miniſters *living privately*; yet ſaith expreſly, that he is to labour mean while privately, upon particular occaſions offered, (why they may not be alſo ſought, I know not) to ſtrengthen and confirm in the ways of God thoſe people that are deprived of his publick Labour. If this be not an allowance of his private preaching, I underſtand it not: But. *Mr.* Bradſhaw *will have the People to ſubmit to the Miniſtry of another in publick, with the liking of the Magiſtrate, tho' he would have them to affect and love the former as their Paſtor.* How congruous this Advice is, I ſhall not enquire, not laying ſo much ſtreſs on mens thoughts

of

of things, as to be turned out of our way by them. But Mr. *Bradſhaw* ſeemeth to ſpeak of a Caſe wherein the *Magiſtrate* is offended with a Miniſter on ſome perſonal account, and another is ſet over the People, with whom they may as lawfully join, as with the former; but that doth not come near to our Caſe, in which Miniſters are reſtrained, becauſe of a Scruple common to them and the People that join with them; to wit, uſing the Ceremonies. Would he have the People, over the belly of Scripture-light, to join with the new Incumbent in *Ceremonies*, and not rather enjoy the Ordinances in purity, tho' in private, from their own faithful Paſtor? I cannot ſee how that can be gathered from his words; but if it was his Opinion, we crave leave to differ from him. Beſide, Mr. *Bradſhaw* did never advife, that ſome Thouſands of Miniſters being all laid aſide at once, ſhould deprive the *Church* of their more private Labours, when they were forcibly reſtrained in publick: The *Non-conformiſts*, in former times, were not in our Circumſtances.

Sect. 24. The Dr. is now come to his *Triarij*, his laſt Argument to prove what was the general Sence of the *Non-conformiſts* in this. It is Mr. *Sprint*'s Argument for Conformity, rather than to be deprived; to wit, That *a leſſer Duty ſhould cede to a greater*: He ſuppoſeth Conformity and Preaching to be a greater Duty than abſtaining from the *Ceremonies*: And he confirmeth this (it ſeemeth) by the Apoſtles, who, he ſaith, ſubmitted to the *Jewiſh Ceremonies*, rather than loſe the Liberty of the Miniſtry. The Dr. I ſee, hath not *kept his beſt Wine till the end of the Feaſt*; this is one of the meaneſt of his Allegations; for the *Non-conformiſts* had an eaſie Anſwer to this Argument, that here a Sin, and forbearing a Duty, are brought in competition; which maketh an eaſie choice, to wit, uſing *unlawful Ceremonies*, with *not preaching in publick*. What he ſaith of the Apoſtles uſing the *Jewiſh Ceremonies*, is quite out of our way, for theſe *Ceremonies* for a time were indifferent, as all acknowledge; but, that ever any of the Apoſtles uſed them, after the full promulgating of the Goſpel, and the Deſtruction of the Temple, when they became not only *mortuæ*, but *mortiferæ*, (as the Schools ſpeak) we utterly deny. But even what he maketh the *Non-conformiſts* anſwer, concerning the greater uſefulneſs and neceſſity of the preaching of the Apoſtles, than of their preaching, maketh nothing for his Deſign: Nor doth it prove, that they did not think that the Apoſtle's, *Wo be unto me, if I preach not the Goſpel*, did reach to their Caſe; for it can import no more, but that if ſuch a great neceſſity might war-

rant some things otherwise not warrantable, (as the *abstaining from things Strangled, and Blood*, was warranted; yea, made necessary by a present necessity) their publick Preaching was not of that moment; and it was only their publick Preaching that was hindred by their *Non-conformity*.

And thus I have got through the Thicket of his *Historical Collections*, and proceed to the *Rational Part* of his Discourse, which, I hope, shall prove less tedious.

PART II.

IN the Second Part of his Book, the Learned Dr. enquireth into the nature of the *Separation* (I wish he had taken as much pains to find out the true Cause of it, and to get that removed); where he considereth the several Principles, on which he alledgeth, That the several sorts of *Dissenters* do proceed in their separating from the *Church*. I am not obliged, nor shall I endeavour to defend all these; the owners of them not agreeing among themselves, let every one stand up for his own Principle. But there is one general Principle that I think *Non-conformists* agree in, That the *Church of England* imposeth some unlawful *Terms of Communion*, and because of not submitting to these, she excludeth the *Dissenters* from her Communion; and being thus excluded, they think it their duty to worship God apart by themselves, when they are not suffered to do it with the Church without Sin. If any do add to this other Principles, I leave the defence of them to their Authors. This is to be further opened in the *Third Part*; where the Dr. examineth the several *Pleas* for *Separation*. He is pleased to take a great deal of pains to refute some things, as insufficient Grounds for *Separation*; which some Dissenters have mentioned in their *Books*, as additional motives, there being other sufficient Reasons for *Non-communion* which never any of them owned, as the sole ground of their practice, or a sufficient Reason for not joining with the *Church* by it self. This is to set up a man of Straw, that he may get a Victory by bearing him down. Instances enough of this kind will occurr in our progress. I shall consider what is argumentative against the Principle already mentioned, that I hold.

SECT.

SECT. I.

Some Opinions about Separation from the Church of England *Examined.*

THE *Diſſenters*, with reference to the Principles of their withdrawing from the *Church*, he divideth into two ſorts: 1. Such as hold *partial* and *occaſional Communion* with the *Church*, lawful; but not *total* and *conſtant Communion*; and that they may chuſe Communion where there is greater purity and edification. 2. Such as hold any Communion with the *Church* to be unlawful, becauſe they believe the Terms of its *Communion* to be unlawful; ſuch as the *Liturgy*, *Croſs*, *&c.* This diſtinction is unhappily ſtated; for, 1. *Non exhaurit diviſum.* There is a third ſort, who hold *partial* and *occaſional Communion* lawful, but not *total* and *conſtant*, and yet believe the *Churches terms of Communion* unlawful; and becauſe of that Belief, cannot communicate *totally* and *conſtantly* with Her. We can hear a Sermon, join in Prayer, without partaking in any of the unlawful *Terms of Communion*, to wit, *Ceremonies* and *Liturgy*; but we cannot enjoy other Ordinances; and often we are even excluded from theſe by their *Excommunications*, and therefore muſt ſeek the Ordinances elſewhere. 2. *Partial* and *Occaſional Communion* are not the ſame thing; nor *total* and *conſtant*, as to the lawfulneſs of them. One may have *communion* with you, and that not only *occaſionally*, but *conſtantly*, in God's Ordinances that are kept pure; and yet refuſe *communion* with you in your own devices, and in thoſe Ordinances of God, that ye have ſo annexed thoſe devices to, that the one cannot be had without the other. And there are ſome that practiſe accordingly; they wait on your Sermons and Pulpit-prayers *conſtantly*, but refuſe the reſt of your Worſhip. 3. I think there are few, if any *Non-conformiſts*, that think the *Terms of Communion* with your Church lawful, and can keep *occaſional communion* with Her, and yet *ſeparate* for greater purity and edification. If any ſuch be, they make a cauſeleſs *Separation* indeed.

Sect. 2. He will now proceed with all clearneſs, (which he hath not done in the fore-mentioned diſtinction) and conſider three

things; 1. What things are to be taken for granted by the ſeveral Parties. 2. Wherein they differ among themſelves about the nature and degrees of *Separation*. 3. What the true ſtate of the preſent Controverſie about *Separation* is. For the firſt, he ſaith, *There are three things that we cannot deny.* And I ſay, There is not one of the three, but they are to be denied, or at leaſt diſtinguiſhed, and not admitted, as he ſetteth them down: The firſt of them is, *That there is no reaſon of Separation, becauſe of the Doctrine of our Church.* I do cordially agree with the learned Authors, whom he citeth in the proof of this, p. 95. That there is no cauſe of *ſeparating* from the *Church of England*, or refuſing communion with all Her Congregations, on account of that which is the *Doctrine of the Church*, contained in the 39 *Articles*; for we aſſent to them all as true, except thoſe about *Biſhops* and *Ceremonies*; and we would not *ſeparate* from the Church, becauſe of Doctrinal miſtakes in theſe things, if the owning of them were not *impoſed* as *Terms of our communion* with Her. But it is not ſo eaſie to perſwade us, that there is no juſt cauſe to withdraw from the Communion of ſome particular Pariſhes in *England*, where *Arminianiſm* or *Socinianiſm* is commonly taught; where the practice of Godlineſs is ridiculed, and Principles ſtriking at the root of it, are inſtilled into the Hearers; ſuch as, That *all the aids of the Spirit that men pretend to look after, that are above that Exerciſe of their own Faculties, that is in their own power, is but fancy; that the Perſon of Chriſt is not to be minded by Chriſtians, but only obedience to his Laws; that, Reſting on Chriſt, Rolling the ſoul on him, are no fit expreſſions of Faith.* What would the Dr. have ſerious Chriſtians, who are concerned about the Salvation of their Souls, do, when ſuch a Miniſter is ſet over them? Shall they hear him? That were to ſit down to a Table, where Poiſon is ſtrewed over all the Meat, and it is hard, if not impoſſible, at the beſt dangerous, to pick out a wholſome bit. And it is contrary to *Solomon*'s Advice, *Prov.* 19. 27. *Ceaſe, my ſon, to hear the Inſtruction that cauſeth to erre from the words of knowledge.* They who would have ſuch Doctrine heard, but not received, may as well adviſe to go to the Stews, but not commit Fornication. Should they complain to Superiors, againſt the erroneous Preacher? But what if they get no redreſs, and the Heretick be countenanced and dignified, notwithſtanding that all this is known to the World, by the Preſs, as well as the Pulpit? What if ſuch a Caſe as this, or little leſs evil, be not rare? Ought not people to ſeek their Souls Food in corners,

when

when they cannot have it in the publick Aſſembly, being mean while ready again to join with the Aſſembly, when the Lord ſhall remove this ſtumbling-block?

Sect. 3. The Second Conceſſion of his Adverſaries, that the Dr. ſetteth down, is, That *there is no other Reaſon of Separation, becauſe of the Terms of Communion, than what was from the beginning of the Reformation.* A ſufficient refutation of this may be ſeen, *Par.* 1. *Sect.* 1, 2, 3, 4. If he can tell of ſome Alterations that have been made to the better, we can tell, and have told of others made to the worſe. It may be, *Mr. Baxter* thinketh *Lay-communion* eaſier than before; he thinketh it ſo eaſie, that he practiſeth more of it than his Brethren can do. But that is no proof. What he objecteth from the practice of the Martyrs is above anſwered. The Third Conceſſion; That *Communion with the* Church of England *hath been ſtill owned by the Reformed Churches abroad.* I have before anſwered this alſo, ſhewing, That though ſome of the Divines, (for no Churches ever gave any hint to that purpoſe) in their condeſcendency, have ſhewed averſion from our withdrawing, yet they have laid down Doctrinal Principles, that neceſſitate what they are ſo averſe from. Their *receiving the Apology and Articles of our Church into the harmony of Confeſſions*, the Dr. bringeth as an Argument againſt Separation from Her: But it is a frivolous Argument, both becauſe the Collection of theſe *Confeſſions* is not the work of the Churches, but of a private Writer; as alſo, becauſe the Author of that Book reckoning *England*, among the Proteſtant Churches, doth not by ſo doing oblige all to ſubmit to her unlawful *Impoſitions.* What *Durel* hath ſaid, or he or others can ſay of the good opinion of *Reformed Divines* of the Conſtitution, and Orders of the *Church of England*, may ſoon be Balanced by Teſtimonies, out of the ſame Reverend Divines, Condemning her *Ceremonies* as relicts of *Popery.*

Sect. 4. The Second thing that he inſiſteth on, he beginneth, *Sect.* 2. to examine the ſeveral Hypotheſes and principles of *Separation* that are at this day talked of among Diſſenters. He ſaith, ſome ſeem to allow *Separate* Congregations only in ſuch places, where the *Churches* are not capable to receive the Inhabitants. And this he groundeth on ſome paſſages, wherein ſome had defended their Meeting-Houſes by this Conſideration, that all the Inhabitants in *London* could not hear in the *Churches.* But did ever any of them ſay, that this was either the only, or main reaſon of their Meetings?

ings? or was it not rather brought as an Additional Consideration, to blunt the Edge of that Clamour, that was raiſed againſt *Non-conformiſts* Preaching, by them, who neither could benefit the People themſelves, nor would ſuffer others to do it; whereas the *Non-conformiſts* had other reaſons for not joining with the *Church*, but worſhipping God without *Humane Mixtures*, in other Aſſemblies? But even that reaſon might have ſome weight, *ad hominem*, againſt the Silencers of *Non-conformiſt* Miniſters: I hope to give better reaſons in due time and place, for the *Non-conformiſt* Miniſters Preaching: But I am very free to declare, that in a *Church* where there is no cauſe of withdrawing from her Ordinances, this alledged is not ſufficient.

Sect. 5. Some, ſaith he, *Sect.* 3. *do allow Communion with ſome Parochial Churches in ſome Duties, and at ſome Seaſons; but not with all Churches, in all Duties, and at all times.* And from this he chargeth the *Separation* as a Myſtery, as if we dealt not openly and ingeniouſly in ſetting down our opinion. But I ask the Dr. who of the *Non-conformiſts* did ever thus expreſs their opinions without further Explication? And if none have, it is not Candour ſo to repreſent us: We deſire not to walk in the Dark, nor are we aſhamed of our Principles. We profeſs then, That in Pariſhes, where Truth is Preached, and not dangerous Error, and in thoſe Ordinances, to which no *Humane Ceremonies* are annexed, as Preaching and Prayer; and when we are not obliged to wait on the Ordinances in thoſe Aſſemblies, where we have all the Ordinances in purity, as we cannot even in the Pariſh mentioned, becauſe of unlawful *Impoſitions* made the *Terms of our Communion* with them: I ſay thus, we can join with them; but not otherwiſe. I hope there is no Labyrinth in this Declaration of our opinion.

Sect. 6. He is at much pains to prove, that we go upon the ſame principles with the *Old Separatiſts*; which he proveth of ſome of the People, out of Mr. *Baxter*'s reproof of them for their unſoberneſs: I know the Reproofs of that Learned Author, were ſometimes dealt at Random: But if any of the People have undue apprehenſions of things, and underſtand not ſo well as need were, what they profeſs, will that ruin our cauſe? Is there no ſuch blame among his Party? Do they all ſpeak Judiciouſly, and Soberly, and with no Tincture of *Popiſh Principles* in managing their *Conformity*. But he will (p. 103.) have even our Teachers to come near to the principles of the *Old Separatiſts*; *for what matter*

is

is it, saith he, *as to the Nature of the Separation, whether the Terms of our Communion be called Idolatrous or unlawful? whether our Ministery be called a false or insufficient Ministry? scandalous Usurpers and Persecutors? Whether our Hierarchy be called Antichristian, or Repugnant to the Institutions of Christ? Anſ.* 1. A difference ſufficient to make our *Separation* lawful, and theirs unlawful, is, that we withdraw, being put away by the *Church*, for not ſubmitting to unlawful *Terms of Communion*: Theſe left the *Church*, and would not join with her, even tho' theſe *Terms* had not been impoſed; looking on the *Church* as no true Church. *Anſw.* 2. Whatever fault we find with the Miniſters of the *Church* and the *Hierarchy*, we do not *ſeparate* becauſe of theſe; we would join with you for all theſe Grievances, if you would but ſuffer us to do it, without ſinning againſt God in that, which is our perſonal Action. I hope he will not alledge, that the *Old Separatiſts* were of that principle.

Sect. 7. But this, to wit, that we are of the ſame principles with the *Old Separatiſts*, the Dr. will *make manifeſt*: And that, 1. *As to the People.* 2. *As to the Miniſters of the Church. As to the People, Sect.* 4. he ſaith, *We diſown the Old Separation; and yet make the Terms of Lay-communion for Perſons, as Members of the Church unlawful.* This I own, ſave that I am not willing to contend with him about the Term, *Members of the Church*; let the thing be underſtood, to wit, that we think it unlawful to join in the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*; and ſeeing we cannot have Gods Ordinances without theſe, with the *Church*; we think it our duty to ſerve God without theſe apart among our ſelves: Yet are ready to worſhip God with the *Church*, when they ſhall pleaſe to ſuffer us to do it, without theſe *Impoſitions*: This, I ſay, being underſtood; we matter not much, whether he call this a caſting off of *Membership* with the *Church or not.* Mr. *Baxter*, he ſaith, calleth it *Schiſmatical in the Church, to deny Baptiſm without the ſign of the Croſs, and God-fathers; and the Communion without Kneeling; and that People, in this caſe, may join with other Paſtors, that will otherwiſe Baptize, and give the Communion.* And I ſay the ſame: *What is this*, ſaith the Dr. *but formal Separation. Anſ.* It is nothing elſe. And what hath he gained by that Conceſſion? For who ever queſtioned but there is a *Separation* in the *Church of England*, between the rigid *Impoſers* and the *Diſſenters*: But the Queſtion is, Who is the culpable cauſe of the *formal Separation*, and conſequently who are the *Schiſmaticks*? whether the *Impoſers* or the *Scruplers*? I know no way to determine

mine this queſtion, but by falling upon the Merits of the Cauſe, and deciding whether the things ſcrupled be lawful to be uſed, and fit to be impoſed on them, who conſcienciouſly ſcruple them, ſo as no forbearance ſhould be uſed in them, what ever may follow. If both theſe can be proved (as I am ſure neither of them can) we were the *Schiſmaticks*: If not, unbyaſſed men will adjudge that Epithete to the Dr. and his Party. If he had pleaſed to put the Matter to this Iſſue, the far greateſt part of his Book might have been ſpared.

Sect. 8. Neither hath the Dr. any advantage, by what he next bringeth out of Mr. *Baxter*; to wit, *It may be Schiſm to ſeparate from a Church, that hath ſome Schiſmatical Principles, Practices, and Perſons. If theſe be not ſuch, and ſo great, as to neceſſitate our departure from them*, for there is ſuch a Caſe ſuppoſeable; yet we affirm, That the *Schiſmatical* Principles, and Practices, and Perſons in the *Church of England*, to wit, the *Clergy impoſing* the *Ceremonies*, *as Terms of our Communion* with them, are ſuch as Neceſſitate our departure: Or rather, they do by theſe drive us away. The *Old Separatiſts*, ſaith he, *did not renounce total Communion with our Church; but held Communion in Faith with its Lawful* (ſo do we with all the ſound Chriſtians in the World, tho' we hold no *Church* Communion with them for want of opportunity) and *private Chriſtian Communion* (neither is this in the Queſtion) *and in ſome Acts of Worſhip, as hearing and joining in Prayer, and yet were charged with Separation by the Old Non-conformiſts. Anſ.* They were juſtly charged with *Separation*, becauſe their Principles would *ſeparate* them from a *Church*, that gave no juſt cauſe by unlawful *Impoſitions*; which ours do not. The *Separation Materially* is the ſame; that is, here are two Parties gone aſunder, as were there: But not *Formally*; for their principle was, The *Church* was no true *Church*, and Miniſtry and Ordinances were Nullities. Ours is, *Unlawful Terms of Communion* are required; and for our Non-ſubmiſſion to theſe, we are expelled by force. He ſaith, We muſt hold a Neceſſity of *Separation*. *Anſ.* So we do, as things now ſtand: But this Neceſſity is not of our making, but of our Brethrens making, and therefore they muſt bear the blame of it. It no way followeth, which he inferreth, that *we muſt be Separatiſts*: For it is an uncontroverted Truth, That they only are *Separatiſts*, who *ſeparate* without juſt cauſe, which we deny to be imputable to us. The *medium* that he inſiſteth ſo much on, p. 104. is but a Quibble; to wit, either we are *Members of the Church of* England, or of no *Church*, or of another *Church*: If

the

the firſt we muſt Communicate as Members: If the Second, we are no good Chriſtians: If the Third, we own as *formal a Separation*, as ever any did. All this hath been before anſwered, but the Dr's repeated Importunity forceth Repetitions from us. I ſay then, there is here ἀδιάφορον. If we own our ſelves as *Members* of the *Church of* England, it will not follow that we are obliged to partake with her in corrupted Ordinances, that is, her Sin to impoſe, and were our Sin to yield to. There were *Members* of the *Jewiſh Church* in her degenerate times, who ſinned not in abſtaining from *Baal*'s worſhip, and the Groves, and High Places. If we ſhould ſay the 2*d*. That we are at preſent Members of no *Church*, that underſtood *ſano ſenſu*, might be our Affliction, and not our Sin, for if a Man be caſt into a place where there are no Chriſtians to join with, or none that will let him join with them, without he ſin againſt God, he is not to be blamed if he Worſhip God by himſelf: Every good Chriſtian is a *Member* of the *Univerſal Church*; and ought to join himſelf to ſome particular *Church* if he can: But it doth not always derogate from a Mans Chriſtianity, that his Circumſtances are ſuch, that he is not *Actually* in Communion with any particular *Church*. If we ſhould ſay the 3*d*. it is true, we own a *Formal Separation*; but the Culpable Cauſe of it is not in us.

Sect. 9. If any ask, which of theſe three we do indeed own? I might anſwer as above, *Section* 7. that the Queſtion is not very material, and but about words. Yet ſeeing the Dr. ſeemeth to lay ſuch weight on the Word, *Members of the Church*, I ſhall open this a little further. And 1*ſt*. I ſay *ad hominem* by the Dr's Doctrine we are not, nor never were (moſt of us) *Members of the Church of* England; and therefore not capable of Culpable *Separation* from her; on what ever accompt we *ſeparate*: For he aſſerteth, *part* 3. p. 350, 351. that the Miniſter in uſing the *Sign of the Croſs* after Baptiſm, and ſaying, *we receive him into the Congregation of Chriſt's Flock, and do ſign him with the Sign of the Croſs*, &c. doth ſpeak in the name of the *Church*; and ſo as Baptiſm is a rite of Admiſſion into the *Catholick Church*: So the *Sign of the Croſs* is into our *Church of* England. I leave the Examination of the Truth of what he here aſſerteth to its due place. I only now conſider, ſeeing this Learned Author taketh this *croſſing* to be the admitting rite into the *Church of* England, how he can look on us as *Members* of that *Church*, who were never ſo admitted into it: And if we never were Mem-

bers in it, how can we be blamed for *ſeparating* from it? But I am not ſo fond of this notion of the Dr's coining as to excuſe our *Separation* by it; I make no other uſe of it but *ad hominem*: And I think it will be hard for him to Anſwer it. But I come *ad rem*: The Term *Church-member* is a relative Term; it importeth a Relation between a Perſon and a *Church*. Now in all Relatives, there are the two *termini*, the Things or Perſons related, and the *Fundamentum Relationis*: That which maketh them ſo to be related one to another; which muſt be ſomething ſo particular to them, that it is not common to them with all other perſons or things. And this is that we here enquire after. That which maketh our relation to the *Univerſal Church* is Baptiſm, and our viſible owning of our *Baptiſmal Covenant*. That which foundeth ones relation to a *particular Church*, is the Obligation that he hath to join with that *Church*; and the right he hath to be received into its Fellowſhip, or admitted to the Ordinances in it. This Right and Obligation is either *remote*, or *proximate*: A *Remote* right and obligation to Communicate with every particular *Church* as occaſion ſerveth, every viſible Believer hath; this is a part of the *Communion of Saints*, that they ſhould join with one another, and receive one another as providence giveth opportunity; and thus every viſible Believer is *Aptitudinally*, a Member of all the *Churches* of Chriſt. But the *Proximate* Right that one hath, and the *Proximate* Obligation that he is under *hic & nunc* to join with, and be admitted to the Ordinances in a particular *Church*, is that which doth actually make him a *Member* of it. And the Foundation of this is not the rite of Admiſſion, whether it be the Dr's *Croſſing*, or the *Independents* declaring their Aſſent to the *Church-Covenant*, or whatever other outward Expreſſion men do pitch on for that end; for theſe are but the external declarative Signs, not the effecting cauſe of ſuch Right or Obligation: and therefore theſe are but the Tokens, not the Foundation of *Actual Membership*. But the true Foundation of the Obligation mentioned, is ones being ſo Circumſtantiated, that he may conveniently wait on the Ordinances here rather than elſewhere; which is determined by his place of reſidence (not that I think the Diviſion of Pariſhes a Divine, but a Civil Conſtitution; yet it hath its uſe for ſhunning confuſion.) And the true Foundation of his right to be admitted, is his being a Viſible Believer.

Sect. 10. This Obligation to join with a *particular Church*, may be ſuſpended by that *Church's* refuſing the Ordinances to the Man, unleſs

unleſs he will ſubmit to their unlawful Impoſitions; and his right may alſo be ſuperſeded, and the *Church* not obliged, to admit him to Ordinances, by his contradicting his profeſſion by *Hereſie* or *Scandal*. Wherefore as every one that liveth within the Precinct of a Pariſh, is not to be owned as a *Member* of that *Church* as *Papiſts*, *willful Deſerters* of the *Church*, *Atheiſts*, &c. So every one that liveth in a Pariſh, is not to act as a Member of that *Church* in all things: As they who cannot with a good Conſcience ſubmit to theſe *Terms of Communion*, which that *Church* doth ſinfully require: To clear this a little further, conſider; that to make Actually and Compleatly a *Member* of a *particular Church*; beſide his reſidence, there is required a mutual conſent of the *Church* and *Perſon*; and that either *Explicite*, or *Implicite*: The *Implicite* conſent of the *Church* lies in ordinary giving the Ordinances to ſuch a Perſon, Word, Sacraments, Diſcipline: The *Implicite* conſent of the Perſon lyeth, in ordinary uſing of, or ſubmiſſion to theſe. Now where the *Church* is willing, and the Perſon is not, and his unwillingneſs is from no allowable cauſe, the Perſon may be charged with *ſinful Separation*, where the Perſon is willing, but the *Church* is not. And this unwillingneſs may be expreſſed either by abſolute refuſal, or by refuſal, unleſs the Perſon will ſubmit to ſinful Conditions, the Perſon is no *Separatiſt*; but the *Church* doth ſinfully cauſe a Separation. In this laſt caſe (which is our caſe) the Perſon is a Member *affectu*, but not *effectu*. This is (to apply this whole diſcourſe to the caſe in hand) we are Members of the *Church of* England *affectu*, *i. e.* Being by providence fixed in *England*, where Chriſt's Truth is profeſſed, and his Ordinances adminiſtred; we are willing to join with his people in the ordinary Aſſemblies of that *Church* in the waiting upon all his Ordinances; yet we are not Members of that *Church Effectu*; becauſe the *Church* will not ſuffer us to Anſwer that Obligation that we are under, to join in the Ordinances, without ſubmitting to ſinful *Terms*: And therefore becauſe we cannot pleaſe God by living without his Ordinances, we meet privately in little occaſional Aſſemblies, for the preſent diſtreſs, where we have Chriſt's Ordinances purely Adminiſtred; and there we are *effectu Members*, where we thus ordinarily meet. And for all this we are ſtill Members of the *Church of* England *affectu*, for we declare a readineſs whenever theſe unlawful barrs from Communion with her ſhall be removed, that we diſſolve theſe *ſeparate* private Aſſemblies, and join in Chriſt's pure Ordinances in

the Parishes where our Lot shall be cast. If after all this, the Dr. or his Party, will charge us, as he doth, with *Obscurity* and *Tergiversation* in declaring our principles; and *Prevarication* in manageing of them we must bear that injustice.

Sect. 10. He dealeth, p. 105, 106, 107. with some of his Adversaries about their opinion, how far they reckon Communion with the *Church of England* lawful. I have so fully set down my opinion in this (and I hope *Presbyterians* will generally say the same things, tho' many of them may word them better) that I think it not needful to interpose in that debate; especially some positions of *Nonconformists* whom he citeth, I will not defend. He taketh up part of p. 107, 108, 109. in proving that *Occasional Communion* with the *Church of England* doth not make them who ordinarily join in other Assemblies, to be *Members* of the *Church*, nor excuse them from *Separation*. I have nothing to say either against his Assertion or Proofs: For it is not *Occasional Communion* alone, but that with a readiness for *constant Communion* with her, when her unlawful Bars from it shall be removed, that both doth answer that Obligation that is on us to join with her, and so maketh us *Members* so far as we can; and doth also excuse us from a Culpable *Separation*.

Sect. 11. Some of his Answerers had yielded to *Occasional Communion* with the *Church of England*, and that notwithstanding of some *defective modes of Worship*, because holding Communion with one *Church* exclusively of others is contrary to *Catholick principles*. This he highly derideth, and laboriously refuseth, p. 110, 111, 112, 113. What is Argumentative I shall touch. *It is not their* (saith he) *Obligation to Peace and Unity with the Church, as Members of it, that moveth, but a certain* Romantick fancy *of Catholick Unity*. *Ans.* That respect to Peace and Unity inclineth us to constant Communion with the *Church*; but unlawful *Impositions* hinder the effect of these Inclinations: And therefore by the fault of the *Imposers*, we have no other way to shew our owning the *Church* as a true Church, but this *Occasional Communion*: Let him call it a *Romantick Fancy*, or what he will; we *separate* from no true *Church*, and much less from that where we live, but so far as we needs must to shun sinning against God. Again, he argueth from a supposition, That *if we were at* Jerusalem, *where there is occasion of Communion with all sorts of the Eastern Churches; and one should ask us what Church we were Members of. If we should Answer, we are fixed Members of no Church, but can have Communion occasionally with all tolerable Churches. Would they take such a*

Man-

Man for a Chriſtian? Anſ. We are under no Obligation to make ſuch an Anſwer, as he feigneth for us, for his own advantage. I ſhould in that caſe join my ſelf to the pureſt *Church* that I could there meet with (being at Liberty to chooſe, and not prelimitted by my habitation) if I could do it without ſinful *Terms* of *Communion*: And then ſhould Anſwer to the Queſtion, I am here free to join with you, or any *tolerable Church*, but do Actually join with you as the pureſt, during my abode here. When I am at home I would join with the Publick Aſſembly, in the True Proteſtant *Church of* England; but that her Rulers impoſe *unlawful Terms of Communion*, which forceth me and others to join together in Worſhipping God apart, and in that Aſſembly I am a Member, till I can find a ſinleſs acceſs to the Publick Aſſembly; where I deſire to be a Member. I ſuppoſe the *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, ſuch as are ſober and ſerious of them, and are duly informed of the State of our Debates, would not think me no Chriſtian for this Anſwer, nor deny me *Occaſional Communion* for it. I am ſure if they did, they ſhould not then walk by the Rules of the Goſpel.

Sect. 12. Another argumentative Conſideration is, p. 111. *We were baptized in the Church of* England, *and received as Members of it: If then we communicate with it only occaſionally, we renounce our membership. Anſ.* Whereever one be baptized, that Baptiſm maketh him only a Member of the *Catholick Church*. If an Inhabitant of *England* be occaſionally in *France*, and have his Child there baptized in the *Engliſh* way, or in the *French* way, Doth that make it a Member of the *Church of France*, tho' the Child in Infancy be brought to *England*, and there have Education, and continue? The Dr. had not, it ſeems, when his Book had come this length, hatched his fine Notion of the *Sign of the Croſs* being the Rite of Admiſſion, as a Member of the Church of *England*. *Anſ.* 2. We are obliged to *fixed* and *conſtant communion*, though not by our being baptized in this Church, yet by our reſidence in it, and owning the ſame Faith with it, and are willing to own that *Membership* and Obligation: But the *Church*'s ſinful Impoſitions do take off this Obligation; for we cannot by any means or caſe be obliged to ſin, and therefore we do not renounce our *Membership*; but the *Church* hindereth our anſwering that Obligation that our *Membership* layeth on us. The Dr. deſpiſeth this our yielding to *occaſional communion*, and it is no wonder, for his Party (foraſmuch as they talk againſt us for withdrawing) deſire none of our communion, as appeareth.

peareth in excluding us, by impoſing ſuch *terms* as they themſelves count needleſs, and we judge unlawful. But whatever he think of it, it is all that we can do: We would bid more frankly in bargaining about our own matters, but in God's matters dare not go one Ace beyond his Warrant.

Sect. 13. The next thing he bringeth againſt this *Occaſional Communion*, p. 111, 112. is pure Trifling, unworthy of ſo learned an Author; That *this Occaſional Communion cannot be lawful above once or twice in a Man's Life: That there will ariſe a difficult caſe of Conſcience, concerning the lawfulneſs of not conſtant cleaving to the purer Occaſions, and leaving purer Adminiſtrations to join with a defective Church.* For a man may occaſionally have Communion in publick, when he cannot have it in private, and that often: And theſe Occaſions we may embrace in a true Church, which we would not do in a falſe Church, but rather be without the Ordinances for that time. Again, We do not ſpeak of *Occaſional Communion* with the Church, in any of Her corruptions; we ſhould alwaies abſtain from and reprove thoſe, as he ſpeaketh. Theſe things being conſidered, the difficult Caſe of Conſcience, that he fanſies, hath an eaſie reſolution, That when we can enjoy God's Ordinances in the Society to which we are joined, to ſhun the ſinful Impoſitions that are in publick, we ſhould wait on them there, rather than elſewhere; but when that occaſion is not offered, we may join with a Church in ſome things corrupted, in ſuch Ordinances that are not corrupted in it.

Sect. 14. His next Argument is, That *here are no Bounds to the peoples Fancies of purer Adminiſtrations, and leſs defective ways of Worſhip, ſo that there can be no ſtop to ſeparation in this way.* This Argument the Dr. proſecuteth with facetious Scoffs, more than with ſolid Reaſons, which he (but undeſervedly) moſt ſeverely had taxed Mr. *A.* for; he telleth us of *Deſerting our Meetings when the firſt reliſh is over; and going to Anabaptiſts, and thence to the Quakers; and that they are bound to forſake us on the ſame Reaſons that we left the* Church, *unleſs they be ſecure, that the perfection of our way is ſo glaringly viſible to all Mankind, that it is impoſſible for them either to find or fanſy any defect in it.* Nothing here that hath a ſhadow of Argument, but it is already objected and anſwered; but the Dr. falleth into frequent repetitions. I anſwer; It is not only for purer Adminiſtrations, that we withdraw, but to ſhun ſinful Impoſitions, which, I am ſure, neither *Anabaptiſts* nor *Quakers* can juſtly alledge.

Neither

Neither is it the *glaring viſibility*, but the real Scripture-warrant for our way, that condemneth them for departing from us: Nor will *Fanſied Defects* in our way excuſe them, but real ſinful *Terms* in our *Communion*. But that ſome will without cauſe ſeparate from us, is no reaſon why we ſhould not on juſt cauſe withdraw from you. Such a way of reaſoning, from the ill uſe that ſome will make of our doing our Duty, is too vulgar to come from ſo Learned a Pen. The Dr. when he wrote this, had forgotten, it ſeems, what he had ſaid *Iren.* p. 109. where he ſaith, *A Chriſtian is bound to adhere to that Church which appeareth moſt to retain the Evangelical Purity.* Which Aſſertion I no further improve than *ad hominem*, counting it the oppoſite Extreme to what he here pleadeth for: It is incident even to wiſe men, *Dum vitant vitia*; that, *in contraria currunt*, it is downright for us, and againſt himſelf. What he hath *Iren.* p. 116. *A Chriſtian is bound to break off from that Society that injoineth ſome corruptions, as to practice.* What he citeth out of Mr. *Baxter*, is a good and ſound Reproof to them that cauſelely divide the *Church*, if he intended it againſt any others, let him anſwer it. The ſad effects of *R. William*'s Separation in *New-England*, do not concern us further, than to lament them, unleſs the Dr. can prove, that we have no better Reaſon for what we do than he had.

Sect. 15. His Refutation of Mr. *B*'s Anſwer to this Objection, that he had made, I inſiſt not on, ſave that I obſerve his uſual way here alſo, his repreſenting his Adverſaries, as if they held, That *Peoples apprehenſion of a leſs defective way of Worſhip, is ſufficient ground for them to break the Church in pieces.* We think, the leſs defective that Worſhip be, it is the better; but it may be the Dr. as well as Mr. *B.* writeth ſometimes in haſte: Neither do we think *Defectiveneſs* but *real ſinfulneſs*, and that *impoſed* on us as the *Terms* of our *Communion*, a ſufficient ground of Separation: Far leſs do we think, that the Peoples *apprehenſion* of *Defectiveneſs* in Worſhip is a ſufficient ground, unleſs that apprehenſion be founded on Scripture, or ſound Reaſon: And leaſt of all do we think that ſuch apprehenſion can warrant us to break the Church in pieces. The beſt grounded Scruples can only warrant our peaceable withdrawing and worſhipping God apart, which may conſiſt with the *Church*'s being whole and ſound. He doth exceedingly wrong Mr. *B.* and others, in that he imputeth to them an opinion, That *better means of Edification is, by it ſelf, a ſufficient ground of ſeparating from a Church.* If any have ever aſſerted that, let them bear their blame. It may be ſome

might

might mention this as a cumulative inducement to join with other Societies; but none of us ever held, that this alone could warrant a Separation. And yet the Dr. is at a great deal of pains to prove, that neither the *old Separatists*, nor the *New-England-men* ever held such an Opinion, which he might have got us to yield to him without his spending five Pages in the proof of it; but some men labour most in that which is least necessary. I know not what name to give to the Dr's Assertion, p. 117. That *this (greater means of Edification) is now the main support of the present Separation.* Nothing can be spoken with less semblance of Truth.

SECT. II.

Of the Ministry of the Church of England.

FRom *Sect.* 7. and forward, the Dr. debateth against Separation that is grounded on the Church's want of true or rightly qualified Ministers. Here I shall have but little Debate with him; I shall, to cut off Debates, as much as may be, lay down mine own thoughts (which, I think, are not different from those of most sober *Non-conformists*, especially *Presbyterians*) in a few particulars.

1. We look on some of the *Conforming Ministers* as Persons of great worth, and excellent Ministerial Qualifications, and could live with great satisfaction under their Ministry, if it were permitted to us, without our Sin. 2. Others of them we know to be very bad men, and ill qualified for the Work that they undertake; they are Strangers in *England*, who have not seen this. 3. We are dissatisfied with some things in the Calling and Practice of all the present Clergy; we think the very Office of some of them unlawful, as *Bishops*, *Deans*, *Arch-Deacons*, *&c.* and their Ordination by a *Bishop* alone not warrantable; their Call by Patrons, we judge such also; and their using the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* we look on as sinful. These things I now only assert, and shall debate them with the Dr. as they fall in. 4. Yet we deny not any of them, on any or all of these accounts, to be true Ministers, nor to have the substance of a lawful Calling: Let this be understood of *Bishops* and *Deans*, *&c.* as Ministers, not as in these superiour offices. 5. Tho' we think a better and more edifying Ministry than that which most of the People of *England* live under, very desirable, yet we do not think,

think, that any defect that is in their Miniſterial Call, or in the Truth of their Miniſtry is a ſufficient ground for *ſeparating* from the *Church*.

Sect. 2. Theſe things being premiſed, I am reſolved not to take the defence of all that ſome have written of the defects of the Miniſtry, as a ground of *Separation*, tho' I find many things cited by the Dr. that at firſt view may ſeem to have that tendency, (and he improveth them with all the advantage that he can) and yet were not ſo meant. In the very entrance of this diſcourſe, I meet with a moſt unjuſt Imputation laid on us by the Dr. *In general* (ſaith he) *they declare, that they only look on thoſe as true Churches, which have ſuch Paſtors as they approve*; and for this, citeth not one Author, but Mr. *Baxter*. Is this fair dealing? Did ever the *Non-conformiſts* make Mr. *Baxter* their general Repreſentative? or, Hath he ſo much as pretended to write in the Name of them all? Were it candid in us, if we ſhould pick out ſome paſſages out of Dr. *Sherlock's* Book of *The Knowledge of Chriſt*, and impute thoſe opinions to the *Conformiſts*, as their Doctrine in general? Beſide, Mr. *Baxter*, nor no *Non-conformiſt* never made their Approbation the Rule, by which Miniſters are to be judged, the having of whom maketh a true Church: But the Dr. looketh on us as a Company of ſilly Rediculous Men, and is pleaſed often ſo to expoſe us. Mr. *Baxter's* Notion about true *Paſtors*, and true *Churches*, I know he himſelf can beſt defend: And therefore I leave him and the Dr. to debate that Caſe.

Sect. 3. He ſaith, *Sect.* 8. *If the People judge their Miniſters to be unworthy, or incompetent; they allow them Liberty to withdraw, and to ſeparate from them*; and promiſeth to prove it from many paſſages, in ſeveral Books of Mr. *Baxter's* and others Still he repreſenteth us as making the Peoples Judgment the Rule; and that this Judgment is ſufficient ground of *Separation*, not conſidering whether their Judgment be right or wrong; or that there is a Superior Rule, by which all Judgment, whether of people or others, is to be governed. All this we diſown; neither can the Dr. prove that any of us ever owned it Yea, we further deny, that we own a Power in the People to withdraw and *ſeparate* from every Paſtor, who is really unworthy and incompetent. But what he aſſerteth, he endeavoureth to prove by three Arguments. 1. Saith he, p. 122. *They leave it to the Peoples Power, notwithſtanding all Legal Eſtabliſhments, to own, or diſown whom they judge fit.* This we deny.

And the Proof he bringeth of it, is, Mr. *B. ſpeaketh againſt the right of Patronage, and the Power of Magiſtrates in theſe caſes, for the unalterable right of the People. Mr.* A. *ſaith every particular Church hath power to chuſe its own Paſtors. Dr.* Owen *maketh the depriving the people of this Right, a Ground of Separation.* If Dr. *Owen* hath done ſo, let it paſs for a part of the *Independent* Judgment, which was the miſtake of that Eminent Servant of God; others are not of that mind. For Mr. *B.* and Mr. *A's* words no ſuch conſequence can be drawn from them. The People (and neither Patron nor any other) by the Laws of the Goſpel, have the right of Election of their Paſtors; but it doth not follow, that they ought not to bear with being hindred the Exerciſe of this right, for the ſake of Peace and Unity.

Sect. 4. The 2*d.* Argument is, *The People are made Judges of the Worthyneſs and Competency of their Miniſters. This,* ſaith he, *followeth from the former. Anſ.* I have diſowned the former; and therefore this falleth with it. Yet I here diſtinguiſh: The the people have a diſcretive power of judging the fitneſs of the Man that is to be ſet over them with reſpect to their Souls; ſo as he ought not to be obtruded on them, without their being ſatisfied with him. But the Peoples power of judging is not *Authoritative*, nor *Supreme*, much leſs *abſolute*, in this matter; but *Subordinate* to the Paſtors of the *Church*, who have power of trying the Perſon Elected by the People, and rejecting him if unqualified: For *the Spirit of the Prophets is ſubject to the Prophets*; not to the *People*. As for Paſtors not now to be Elected, but obtruded on the people, and ſettled among them, tho' in an undue way, I ſhall not ſay, that it is the Peoples part to ſeparate meerly for the Inſufficiency of the Miniſter, if the Ordinances be Adminiſtred, ſo as they can partake of them without Sin. That which can warrant withdrawing, muſt be a Depravation of the Ordinances; and that ſuch as importeth my perſonal Action, in partaking of that depravation of the Ordinance, and not every defect or fault, either of the Miniſter or the Ordinance. What Mr. *B.* ſaith of *peoples Duty to get the beſt ſupply they can*, which the Dr. taxeth him for, is not meant of deſerting, or *ſeparating* from a Pariſh, meerly on Accompt of the defective Qualifications of the Miniſter; but either, of *Occaſional Communion* with a better ſupplied Society; which if the Dr. do altogether condemn, he ſhould Preach againſt the Throngs that reſort to him, and leave others under whoſe particular charge they are. Or, when withdrawing is founded on other good Grounds,

that

that people ſhould chuſe better qualified Paſtors, than thoſe they leave: What he ſaith, himſelf muſt Explain and Defend. What Mr. *B.* further ſaith, of the warrantable Preaching of Silenced Miniſters; and of the Magiſtrates impoſing Paſtors, obliging people to adhere to and own theſe; and forſake their own Paſtors, ſettled among them in the way of the Goſpel, come afterward to be debated; and hath in part been ſpoken to above.

Sect. 5. Argument 3*d*. *They give directions to the People, what ſort of Miniſters they ſhould own, and what not.* And doth not the Scripture ſo too? We Affirm people to have a Judgment of *Diſcretion*, both of their Paſtors to be Elected; and alſo of the Doctrine and Adminiſtrations of their Paſtors already in poſſeſſion of the charge of their Souls: And yet that they are not to *ſeparate* from the latter for any defect, ſave that which doth ſo vitiate the Ordinances, as that it is their Sin to join in them. And if the Dr. will not allow them this Judgment (as he ſeemeth to deny it, by his Sarcaſm, *of which*, ſaith he, (to wit, *utter Inſufficiency, and Hereſie*) *the People are admirable Judges*) he muſt introduce implicite Faith and Obedience: And by this Doctrine, it had been a Sin in the People even to have left *Rome* it ſelf; for were not they admirable Judges of the *Hereſie* and *Idolatry* of that *Church*? He that chargeth other mens way ſo fiercely, with a Tendency to *Popery*, ſhould take heed of giving ground for ſuch a Reflection to be made on himſelf. Our Lord doth not ſpeak with ſuch Contempt of the People, as this Learned Dr. doth. He ſaith, *My Sheep hear my Voice; and they know not the Voice of Strangers*, Joh. 10.27. and 5. to deny this Spirit of *diſcerning* to the People of God, is to make them *Sheep* in a literal Senſe; that men may Rule over them as Beaſts. I ſee not ſuch Inconſiſtency in Mr. *B*'s Words, as the Dr. would make us believe; while he ſpeaketh, p. 123. of withdrawing from the utterly Inſufficient and Heretical; and p. 124. that people are not warranted to withdraw for a Miniſters perſonal Faults, nor for his miniſterial Faults, while his miniſtration is not utterly untolerable; if the Dr. can ſhew either the Falſhood, or Inconſiſtency of theſe Aſſertions, we ſhall own it. He alſo wrongeth Mr. *B.* and the *Non-conformiſts*, while p. 124. he telleth us of Mr. *B's outcries againſt the People, as Heady, Raſh, Cenſorious, Proud, Ignorant, ſuch as are ready to Scorn and Vilify the Graveſt and Wiſeſt Preachers*: And hence He (the Dr.) inferreth, that *ſuch are unfit to diſcern the Qualifications of Miniſters*. I ask the Dr. if ever Mr. *B.* ſaid

that the People were all, or generally ſuch: We deny not there are too many that deſerve ſevere Reproofs for ſuch things (and Mr. *B.* hath not been too ſparing in his Cenſures of them) but is there any ſhadow of reaſon for inferring thence, That all the People ſhould be deprived of the Right, that Chriſt by his Teſtament hath bequeathed to them? It were as reaſonable to ſay, that becauſe many men Miſguide, or Debauch away their Eſtates; therefore no man ſhould have the Power of managing his Eſtate. Chriſt hath provided Diſcipline and Authority in his Houſe to Curb the Extravagancy of ſuch perſons, and to reſtrain the Power of Election, when it is miſ-managed, as is above-ſaid: And he needed not the Dr's, and the *Prelates* device to prevent this miſchief, by putting the power of Election into the Hands of a *Patron*; who (may be) a *Papiſt, Atheiſt, or Enemy to Godlineſs*, and ſo leſs fit to chuſe one to take the charge of mens Souls, than any of the Perſons deſcribed.

Sect. 6. And if Mr. *B.* ſay, That *the heady Perſons mentioned, are commonly the moſt violent, and will judge in ſpite of the reſt:* Yet the Remedy that I have mentioned, is for reſtraining of them, and is like to do it better than what the Dr. is for, can do. Neither doth Mr. *B.* nor any of us, allow theſe heady perſons to be the deciſive Judges either of who of his ſide, or who of our ſide are true and ſufficient Miniſters: Which the Dr. might have known, and ſo ſpared much of his diſcourſe; which I ſhall not Tranſcribe. That which Mr. *B.* telleth of many young, rare, injudicious Preachers in *England*, was never look'd on as ſufficient ground of *Separation* by it ſelf; as the Dr. inſinuateth. But it is a ſad grievance, and theſe men withal impoſing ſinful *Terms of Communion* on the people (for who greater Zealots for *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* than they) and there being many faithful and qualified Miniſters laid aſide from their publick work; is it any wonder that people leave the one, and cleave to the other? The Ground that I have already laid down, will juſtifie our withdrawing from the Miniſters even in *London*, however Grave and Learned they be, and however Capacious their *Churches* be: For even *their* ſinful *Terms of Communion* are impoſed.

Sect. 7. He alledgeth, *Sect.* 9. That by this means *Separation* cannot be kept out of any *Church* whatſoever. This is true if the Dr. have liberty to make our opinion to be what he pleaſeth to have it, that he may the better refute it. But if our opinion be rightly

rightly underſtood, and if we be heard ſpeak for our ſelves; it is moſt falſe. I hope there are *Churches* where the Miniſters generally are ſound in Doctrine, and mix nothing with God's Ordinances as *Terms of Communion* with them, that is unlawful: In a Word, There are *Churches* where, tho' Miniſters be not faultleſs, yet the ordinances are pure; or if there be any thing amiſs in the Ordinances, people are not required to own it perſonally: From ſuch we will not withdraw. He bringeth Four Qualities that Mr. *B.* required in Miniſters; the want of which may warrant to withdraw from them: *Tolerable Knowledge: That they be not Heretical: That they be not oppoſers of ſerious Godlineſs: That they be not ſo vicious in their Lives as to do more hurt than good.* If theſe qualities were to be conſidered by a People about to Elect a Miniſter, it is not difficult to determine what Obligation lieth on people to ſhun the man that wanteth them: But it is another caſe, when the Qualities of a Miniſter under whom we are, come to be conſidered in order to warrant caſting off his miniſtery. A general Determination of this I have already given; to wit, that no other qualities of the Miniſter doth warrant withdrawing, but ſuch as ſo vitiate the Ordinances, as my perſonal Concurrence with them is Sin.

Sect. 8. But to conſider theſe Four Miniſterial Qualities in reference to this Caſe: Two things I ſhall ſay of them in general. 1. It is either ſuppoſed, that all the Miniſters of a Nation are ſo ill qualified; or that ſome one, or a few, or moſt of them: In the firſt caſe there is more need of *ſeparate Meetings*: In the laſt ſome leſs need; in the Third yet leſs; and in the Fourth leaſt of all; becauſe peoples wants are more eaſily ſupplied by Neighbour Miniſters in the one caſe, than in the other: tho the need to the Soul under that one bad Miniſter to ſhun him, is as great as that of others to ſhun many. 2. Theſe bad miniſterial qualities may no doubt arrive at that height, and have thoſe Aggravations and Circumſtances, that they may warrant withdrawing from ſuch Miniſters; and when people cannot otherwiſe have God's Ordinances, may warrant *ſeparate Meetings*. The reaſon of this, *a priori*, is, becauſe they may ſo pervert the Ordinances of God, as to make them unlawful to be uſed: This may without difficulty be ſuppoſed to be poſſible: *Ignorance* may be ſuch as neither Word nor Sacraments are ſo much as right for the Subſtance. It is ſo clear in *Hereſie*, that none can doubt it, as in *Papiſts*, *Socinians*, &c. *oppoſing ſerious Religion*

Religion may be the all of some mens Preaching. And even *personal wickedness* of Ministers (which seemeth to be more remote from this Hazard than the rest) may affect the Ordinances, as is exemplified in *Eli*'s Son, the Priest of the Lord; their intemperance and covetousness made *Non-conformists* in *Israel*, that were not chargeable for their withdrawing: For their taking the Flesh by violence from the People, before the Fat was burnt, was contrary to the Institution of that Ordinance; in which first the Blood was to be sprinkled, then after the slaying and opening, the Fat was to be burnt; And after that the Priest was to have his part; as may be seen, *Levit.* 7. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. And before the burning of the Fat to the Lord, the Flesh was not Holy, and so not the Priests Portion, saith *J. Martyr, in locum.* This was so observed among the very Heathens (who imitated in many things the Jewish Sacrafices; That *haud immolata sacra devorare*, was proverbial, to express a Belly-god; such as *Eli*'s Sons were. This was their Sin, whereby they did pervert Divine Ordinances from the Institution, 1 *Sam.* 2. 14, 15, 16; and it is said *ver.* 17. That *Men abhorred the Offerring of the Lord.* Some Translate it, *Retrahebant homines a Sacrificiis Domini*, they shunned offerring Sacrifices (saith *Vatablus*) beholding the Avarice of the Priests, and when they saw that the wonted rites of Sacrificing were not observed, saith *Menochius*: And it yet further appeareth from *ver.* 24. that this their Fact did affect the Ordinances, and made people withdraw from them; *You make the People of the Lord Transgress*, saith *Eli*. There is no reason to restrict this to their uncleanness mentioned, *ver.* 22. For *Eli* heard beside that, *of all that they did to Israel*; and no doubt his Reproof had respect to all. Some Translate *ver.* 24. *Abigitis populum Domini*, i. e. *efficitis ne hinc veniat populus ad Sacrificandum.* So *Vatablus.* All this considered, we must not think it absurd, to say that people may see such things in their Ministers, as may warrant deserting of them.

Sect. 9. If this should be denied, the Clergy should be *Lords over God's Heritage*, to all ends and purposes, and might teach what they would, and do what they would, and bring into the Church what they would, instead of Christ's Ordinances; and the People be still oblig'd to hear them, and join with them in all these abominations; they might lead the People in the way to Hell, who were still obliged to follow them. 3. The People have a Right of discerning and judging, in reference to their own practice, whether their

their Miniſters be ſo qualified, as that they may ſafely live under their Miniſtry: This doth neither import, that they may determine in this what they will; nor that they are not to blame, if they judge amiſs; nor that they have Authority to paſs a Sentence on their Miniſters (that belongeth to the Paſtors); nor that all of them are ſo qualified for this Judging, as were to be wiſhed; yet, that they have ſuch a Right, cannot be denied, without obliging them to blind obedience, and regardleſneſs of their own Souls; and Scripture alloweth it, when it alloweth People to admoniſh Miniſters in reference to their work, *Col.* 4. 17. This Command the *Coloſſians* could not obey, if they had no power of diſcretive judging, whether *Archippus* fulfilled his Miniſtry, or not. Without this, people were obliged to caſt themſelves into Temptation and hazard of Soul-ruine by a Deceiver or Soul-murderer. This was both the Principle of the *Primitive Church*, *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 68. *Plebs obſequens præceptis Domini a peccatore præpoſito ſeparare ſe debet.* And it was their common practice, (tho' I confeſs ſometimes on no ſufficient grounds) they *ſeparated* every where from the *Arian Biſhops* and Paſtors. The *Magdeburgenſes*, *Cent.* 4. 1, 10. *p.* 746. tell us out of *Ruffinus*, *Theodoret*, *Sozomen*, that when *Fœlix* B. of *Rome* had communicated with the *Arians*, the People of *Rome ſeparated* themſelves from him; and that when he taught, none of them came to *Church*: Alſo, *ibid.* p. 772. That *Moſes* refuſed to be ordained by *Lucius* B. of *Alexandria*, becauſe he was an *Arian*, and a Perſecutor, but went to the Exiled Orthodox Biſhops to receive Ordination. I may here put the Dr. in mind (uſing it only as *Argumentum ad hominem*) that an eminent light of their own Church, *Biſhop Jewel*, giving reaſons why the *Engliſh Biſhops* went not to the *Council of Trent* (a formal *Separation*) was, becauſe of *Pope Pius*'s Simony in getting the Chair, and manageing it with Murders and Cruelty. *Full. Ch. Hiſt. lib.* 9. p. 70.

Sect. 10. 4. Breaking the Peace and Unity of the *Church*, is a matter of ſo much weight and conſequence: And the Sin of it (on whatever ſide it lieth) of ſo deep a Die, and ſo great Aggravation; that the greateſt caution is to be uſed, that we do not *ſeparate* for imagined, but real; for ſmall, but very great; for uncertain, but very Evident want; not of every miniſterial quality that is deſirable, but of ſuch as is neceſſary for the Ordinances being ſo Adminiſtred, as we may partake of them without Sin. If People do miſtake in any of theſe, and run into *Separation* without ſuffi-

cient

cient grounds, thinking that fault of a Miniſter true, or great, or evident, or intolerable, which is not ſo; we do not plead for this practice: But we muſt not, to ſhun that inconvenience, ſay, that it is in no caſe lawful. I know no Truth but it may be abuſed by men of Corrupt minds, as well as this. I know there are faults in Miniſters, which render them in the ſecret Judgment of God, and to the Jealouſie of good Men, no Miniſters of Chriſt, but of Satan; which yet will not warrant *Separation* from them, while they have Ordination unrepealed by a *Church* Sentence of Deprivation, and Adminiſter God's Ordinances, ſo as the partaker of them is not involved in Sin. *Gildas* ſaid of ſome Paſtors in his time; *Apparet cum quem vos ſacerdotes---ſciens ex corde dicit, non eſſe eximium Chriſtianum*: And *O inimici Dei, & non Sacerdotes: O lictatores malorum, & non pontifices traditores, & non ſanctorum Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores; Impugnatores & non Chriſti Miniſtri.* When we can apply all this to a Miniſter, the Church ought to caſt him out, as unſavoury Salt: But till that be done, private Perſons ought to withdraw from his evil Deeds; but not from the Ordinances while they are pure. I know this hath been, and is, a Contrôverſie in our Neighbour *Church of Scotland*, and hath given riſe to much diſquiet, much Confuſion, and many Perſecutions there: I ſhall not much dip in it; our Caſe being more clearly Stated: and our withdrawing from the publick Aſſemblies, being founded not on perſonal faults of Miniſters, but on ſinful Impoſitions in Worſhip. I have not met with one judicious Writer of that Nation; nor one Miniſter that I remember of in private diſcourſe, who denieth, *in theſi*, that it is lawful to partake of the Ordinances from a Miniſter, meerly on Accompt of his perſonal faults, where the Ordinances that we are to partake of are incorrupted; but they ſtate the Controverſie upon ſome Specialities in their Caſe. One or Two little Manuſcripts I have ſeen, that *in Theſi* and with as much Confidence, as little Reaſon, deny the lawfulneſs of hearing a ſcandalous Miniſter. To theſe, I only oppoſe this one Argument; Our Lord Commanded the Jews to receive the Ordinances from the Prieſts of that time, who were moſt of them very bad men, *Matth.* 8. 4. *Luk.* 17. 14. and what Chriſt bid them do, we may lawfully do in the like caſe. The Exceptions made againſt this Argument (that I have met with) are very Light, as that the Prieſts were not ſo bad as ours. 1. This is ſaid without all Colour of Reaſon. 2. Let them ſhew what degree of Scandal in a Miniſter will warrant ſuch

withdrawing

withdrawing, and what not. Again, they object, That the Ordinances could not be had, but from theſe Prieſts. *Anſ.* If it had been unlawful to partake with them, Chriſt would rather have had no Sacrifice offered, than that People ſhould ſin in going about it. He that preferreth Mercy to Sacrifice, would never preferr Sacrifice to ſhunning of Sin. And, beſide this, if the hazard of want of Ordinances could inferr the neceſſity of joining with theſe Prieſts, ſo may the hazard of a ſinful rending of the *Church*, perſwade to join in the Caſe in hand. And further, where the Ordinances can, without any ſinful circumſtance, be had from better hands, I am far from adviſing any to attend the Adminiſtrations of bad men: But in that Nation they had better grounds of their practice, to wit, Subjection to *Prelacy*, required of them; and that their faithful Paſtors were turned out, and others put in their Place. But I leave this Debate, as not being my preſent Work.

Sect. 11. I now come to ſay a word of each of Mr. *Baxter*'s four Miniſterial Qualities; in particular, 1. *Knowledge* and *Utterance*: The Ordainers are the Authoritative Judges of theſe; and the People are not without very great and manifeſt cauſe to queſtion what is in this done, by the Guides of the *Church*; yet muſt they ſee with their own Eyes, and lament the defects of this kind, that they evidently ſee, but not *ſeparate*, while the Ordinances are not intolerably depraved, tho' there be conſiderable defects. The Dr. *never heard, that the Apoſtle bid People turn away from their Miniſter for want of Utterance*; neither was ſuch a Command needful, Nature and Reaſon injoining, That if a man cannot ſpeak audibly and intelligible, People ſhould not come to hear a noiſe, ſo that they cannot tell what is uttered. His declamation againſt Peoples judging of a Miniſter's Knowledge, is out of the way; we do not make them *Triers*, as he ſuppoſeth, neither give them Authority; and we think, (for all his ſcorn) that tho' many cannot well diſcern a Miniſter's Knowledge in Controverſie, yet moſt can tell whether he underſtandeth the plain Truths of the Goſpel, when they hear him diſcourſe of them. If men, by prejudices, or want of due application of their minds, (as the Dr. ſpeaketh) miſtake about theſe, I ſhall hardly call them *very good men*; as he ſuppoſeth they may be. The Second Quality is, *That a Miniſter be not Heretical.* Except Taunts and perſonal Reflections on Mr. *B.* I ſee not what the Dr. anſwereth to this. We do not ſay, That *Peoples thinking a man Heretical, when he croſſeth their humours*, is a good ground to *ſepa-*

rate on, as the Dr. would have it thought; neither is it needful for discerning this, that all the People be *Learned Divines*, or have read *Epiphanius* and *Binnius*, as he talketh; but we think, they that diligently read the Scripture, and pray for spiritual Understanding, may discern when manifest Errour against the Foundation of Christian Doctrine is taught; and where they find this to be the way of a Minister, may withdraw from him. I wish the Dr. would speak more plain, that we might see his mind more clearly than we can do by these jeers: Doth he think there are none Learned among the People? or, Doth he think that none of them that want Literature can discern Truth from Errour, in any Case? or, Doth he think, dangerous Errour being discerned to be ordinarily preached, People should attend on that Preaching, instead of the wholsome Food of their Souls, and not seek better means, unless the *Bishops* will give leave? If he be not positive in all these, he saith nothing against Mr. *B.* nor Us, in this matter.

Sect. 12. The Third Quality is, That *Ministers be not Opposers of Godliness*. That is not to be understood of what people will call so without cause; nor of suspected malignity; nor of open opposing of it in the mans private actings, by word or deed; nor of close hints in Sermons against it; nor breaking out sometimes into more open maligning of it: But when this is manifestly the ordinary strain of his preaching; we say, in that Case people may withdraw from a man; for here the Ordinance of Preaching is wholly inverted and turned against that which it was appointed to promote. There is as good ground in this case to desert a Minister, as there is in a besieged Garrison, for the Souldiers to desert their Commander, when he turneth the Guns that are on the Walls, from the Enemy, upon the Town. The *Dr.* rejecteth this, as before, by tart Reflection on Mr. *B.* which whatever it may be, *ad hominem*, is nothing *ad rem*. If Mr *B.* hath sharply reproved some for Censoriousness, Pride, Divisions, *&c.* and these will count this opposing of Godliness, Doth this peevish mistake of theirs prove, that there can be no such thing really committed by a Minister; or if it be, that it should not be resented by the Hearers? Or, if Mr. *B.* sometimes speak at this rate, is this his ordinary Doctrine? or, when men make Railing their ordinary Doctrine, Should people sit and hear that, as God's Ordinance for their Souls edification? The Fourth Quality; *That Ministers be not of a scandalous Life*. Of this the Dr. saith nothing, and I shall say little more than is already

ready ſaid. We do not hold, That perſonal faults in a Miniſter, where the Ordinances are incorrupted, is a ſufficient ground of *Separation* from him. But it cannot but be a ſad Grievance, and make people wait on the Miniſtry of ſuch a perſon with leſs comfort and ſatisfaction, and may warrant people that regard the advantage of their Souls, to lay hold on the firſt opportunity that they can get, to live under a Miniſtry that is more like to be bleſſed.

Sect. 13. He chargeth the *Non-conformiſts* (without exception) *Sect.* 10. with *inſinuating, that the whole body of the conforming Clergy is guilty of ſuch faults as the people may lawfully ſeparate*: A moſt falſe Aſſertion, and unjuſt Charge. Not one *Non-conformiſt* that ever I read or met with, hath ſaid or written this, or words to this effect, but they do generally diſclaim it: But the Dr. undertaketh to prove it by ſome particulars. 1. *They make Conformity it ſelf to be a very ſcandalous thing, and then tell the people over and over again, That it is no ſin to ſeparate from ſcandalous Prieſts, eſpecially where the Scandal is ſo notorious.* I am aſtoniſhed to read this, from the Pen of one whom I am loath to have an harſh thought againſt. We do indeed think *Conformity* a Sin, and being open, it cannot but be a *Scandal*; and we think, that in ſome it ariſing from a regardleſneſs of knowing what is right, becometh yet more ſcandalous; but none of us ever thought, that a miſtake of this nature in men, otherwiſe ſober and conſcientious, was a very ſcandalous thing; or, that it was ſuch a ſcandal, as by it ſelf could warrant *Separation*. But let the Dr. tell us of any one of our way, that ever held this general *Theſis*, That it is no Sin to *ſeparate* from ſcandalous Prieſts, when the Scandal is notorious. I am ſure Mr. *B.* (whom he only citeth on this occaſion) teacheth the contrary oftner than once, particularly *Chriſt. Direct.* p. 718. and his looking on *Conformity* as Sin, and an aggravated Sin, and the preſſing of it as that Sin which they charge us with, to wit, *Schiſmaticalneſs*, do no way prove what the Dr. aſſerteth. When Mr. *B.* ſaith, p. 133. *Can you wonder if the people chuſe more faithful Paſtors?* It doth not make the Clergy's *Conformity* the true Reaſon (nor the main Reaſon neither) of *Separation*; yea, nor doth it import an Approbation of *Separation*, (tho' he doth elſewhere ſhew his Approbation of it) but only ſheweth how you tempt the people to it.

Sect. 14. Another Argument to prove his charge, is *Sect.* 11. *That we count moſt of the preſent Miniſters of the Church of* England *Uſurpers, and that from ſuch we may lawfully ſeparate. Anſ.* We

deny both parts of his Aſſertion, whatever Uſurpation ſome of them may be guilty of. We know moſt of them have the (*tacite* at leaſt) conſent of the people, *a poſt facto*; and therefore, however they might be guilty of intruſion in their entry, in their continuing in their places they are no Uſurpers. Neither do we owa it to be lawful to *ſeparate* from every Miniſter that is an Uſurper, meerly on the account of his Uſurpation. To clear this, I ſhall lay down our opinion about this, in theſe few Aſſertions. 1. The regular way of entring into the Miniſtry, is by the *Election* or Call of the People over whom he is to have charge, and the *poteſtative Miſſion* or *Ordination* of the Paſtors of the *Church*: This will fall in afterward to be debated. 2. It is conſequential to this, That whoever do not enter this way into the Miniſtry, are in ſome degree or other Intruders into that Work. 3. Though the expreſs Call of the people, and their free conſent, be needful to the more orderly Entrance of a Miniſter among them; yet if they implicitely ſhew their conſent, and they being prelimitted by the Preſentation of a Patron, or Commands of the Magiſtrate, if they conſent, that is enough to the ſubſtance of a Call, and maketh the Miniſter that ſo entereth no Uſurper. The reaſon is, becauſe he is only to conſider the Will and Conſent ſufficiently declared, not the motives nor conſiderations that influence their will. Indeed, if the man had any hand by undue means, to influence them to conſent againſt their Duty and right Reaſon, he is, in ſo far, guilty before God: But this doth not nullifie his Call, which conſiſteth in the peoples conſent. 4. There are three ſorts of Uſurpers of the Miniſterial Office or Work. 1. Such as fall upon that Work, without a Call from a people, or Ordination by Miniſters. 2. Such as do it upon a peoples Call, but have no Ordination or poteſtative Miſſion by thoſe in Authority, the *Church* for that end. 3. Such as have Ordination, but take the Charge of a particular Flock, wholly without conſent, or againſt their will. The two former ſorts uſurp the Office; the third uſurpeth that particular Charge that he hath no right to. 5. The Preſentation of a Patron to the Living; the Civil Laws of men, injoining or owning a mans entrance into a place; due Ordination, Inſtitution, and Induction, and what elſe men pleaſe to deviſe, can never make him the Paſtor of ſuch a particular people, without their conſent ſome way had; but without it he is ſtill an Uſurper. This doth follow, from the peoples right of chuſing their Paſtors, which is to be afterward diſcourſed. 6. It is lawful to

Sepa-

Separate from uſurping Miniſters of the firſt and ſecond ſort, becauſe they are no Miniſters; they have only the name of Miniſters, like thoſe that *called themſelves Apoſtles, and were not*, Rev. 2. 2. I hope the Dr. will not deny this. 7. When a Miniſter is obtruded on a People againſt their will; and ſo is an Uſurper of the 3*d.* Sort; if there be no other cauſe of *ſeparating* from him but that, I think (under correction of the more Wiſe and Learned) that they ſhould rather cede of their right (with a *Salvo*) than break the Peace and Unity of the *Church*, or diſoblige the Magiſtrate; and therefore they ought to give their conſent. By this means, their right that Chriſt hath given them is not alienated; it being by them on that occaſion Aſſerted; and the Rending of the *Church* is prevented.

Sect. 15. Let us now hear what the Dr. will ſay, to make good againſt us his charge of our *ſeparating* on this Head. He ſaith, *They have a Legal Eſtabliſhment; and Law and Uſurpation are contraries. Anſ.* Eſtabliſhment by a Civil Law, and Uſurpation of a Civil Office are contrary. Alſo Eſtabliſhment by the Goſpel, and Uſurpation of a Church-Office are inconſiſtent; but Eſtabliſhment by a Civil Law, and Uſurpation of an Office in the *Church*, are very conſiſtent one with another: Becauſe the Office of the Miniſtry is no inſtitution of Man, but of Chriſt; and he giveth Laws to regulate that, and other affairs in his Houſe; and hath not left theſe to be ordered by the Laws of men. I thought the Dr. had been for *Epiſcopal Government* in the *Church*, not for *Eraſtianiſm*. Mr. *B.* is cited, p. 134. aſſerting, That *all that come into the places of Ejected Miniſters, the people not conſenting, are Uſurpers; that the Magiſtrate's Impoſition maketh not ſuch true Paſtors of that Church, without or before the Peoples conſent; nor will it always oblige the People to conſent, and forſake their former Paſtors; nor prove them Schiſmatical, becauſe they do it not:* For diſproving of this, the Dr. firſt *leaveth it to others, to judge of the dangerous Conſequences of this; an Act being paſſed by King and Parliament for removing of ſome Paſtors, and putting in others.* And I deſire that theſe others, who judge of this matter, may conſider, that the ordering of the Miniſterial Call, and the fixing a Religion between Paſtor and People, do fall directly under the Cognizance, and Laws of him who is the Head and Lawgiver in his *Church*, even *Jeſus Chriſt*, and under the Laws of men only, as the Civil Peace may be concerned therein; and let them alſo conſider, that we by owning or diſowning a Paſtoral Relation,

Relation, which the Magiſtrate hath paſſed an Act for or againſt, do manage our principle, and order our practice with that peaceableneſs and caution, that the Magiſtrate may as little as poſſible either know it, or be offended at it; and if we be Convicted of a Tranſgreſſion of the Magiſtrate's Law, we patiently ſuffer the Penalties: Let them, I ſay, Conſider theſe things; and withal Conſider, that to differ from the Magiſtrate in Principle and Practice of Religion, was the Lot of the Primitive Chriſtians; and then let them judge (if they be Impartial Men) whether any ſuch diſmal conſequences as the Dr. inſinuateth, are like to follow.

Sect. 16. He objecteth next, *On thoſe Grounds when* Solomon *deprived* Abiathar, *and put* Zadock *is his room; any part of the People might have pleaded they never conſented to* Zadock's *coming in----The Queſtion is, whether it belonged to the King or the People. Anſ.* There is ſo little ſhadow of Reaſon, or affinity to the queſtion in Hand in this Argument, that it is no ſmall Derogation from the underſtanding of ſo Learned a Man, once to mention it; for the chuſing of a High-Prieſt belonged neither to King nor People; but the Succeſſion was fixed in one Family by the Lord; and it was neither in the Power of the King nor People to chuſe any, but the neareſt Heir of that Line. Wherefore what *Solomon* did in this Caſe, was no more but to inflict a Civil Puniſhment on *Abiathar*, to wit, Exile from *Jeruſalem* (where only the Office of High-Prieſt could be Exerciſed) and Confinement to *Anathoth*: And this was done for his Acceſſion to Treaſon againſt *Solomon*: And *Solomon*'s putting *Zadock* in his place, was no more but obeying the Commandment of God, who had promiſed the Prieſt-hood to *Phinehas*; whoſe neareſt Heir *Zadock* was: And it is the opinion of many Divines, that *Abiathar*'s right to the Prieſthood was not ſo good as *Zadock*'s. Another Argument like the reſt he hath, p. 135. is, *That it follows that a ſmaller part of the People may diſown the Publick Acts of Parliament, and chuſe other Governours in oppoſition to thoſe Eſtabliſhed by Law, and they may do it in one caſe as well as in another. Which makes me wonder* (ſaith he) *at thoſe who dare call them Uſurpers, who enjoy their places by the ſame Laws, that any men do enjoy their Eſtates.* This is a Confounding of things moſt diſparate one from another, a taking away all diſtinction of Civil and Church power. We utterly deny his conſequence, That becauſe people, notwithſtanding of an Act of *Parliament*, may adhere to their Paſtors; therefore they may chuſe other civil Governours (for of theſe he muſt ſpeak, or ſpeak nothing to the purpoſe.) They may not do it in the one caſe as

as in the other; becauſe the one caſe is regulated by Chriſt's Law, the other by Mens Law. But I now ſmell out a miſtake in the Dr. that maketh ſuch Choler and Zeal againſt us, That we count them Uſurpers of their places, that is their Benefices: Let him no more fear that; we own their Title to theſe, to be as good as Men have to their Eſtates, both being diſpoſable by the ſame Law: But all that we have ſaid, is about their Uſurping the Charge of Souls: Of which we Aſſert two things, 1. That there is no neceſſary Connexion *de facto* between a good Title to the one, and to the other, though *de jure* (I mean, *divino*) *beneficium ſequitur officium.* 2. That the ſame Law may give a Title to an Eccleſiaſtick Eſtate, which giveth Title to other Eſtates; but another Law and not that, muſt give a Title to having the charge of Souls, and muſt make a Relation between Paſtor and People: And the reaſon of this Difference I bring from that famous ſaying of *Conſtantine* the Great, to the Church-men, that they were ἐπισκοποὶ τῶν ἔσω, but the τῶν ἔξω.

Sect. 17. He hath yet another Argument; to wit, That *this overthroweth the Reformation, for the Papiſts had the very ſame Plea, that theſe Men have now, to wit, that the Magiſtrate had no Power to diſſolve the Relation between them, and their former Church-guides. Anſ.* If the Dr. will ſay, that the *Popiſh* Clergy had no otherwiſe forfeited their Title to the charge of Souls, than by the Magiſtrates Law, then their Plea, and ours were the ſame. But I ſuppoſe he, as well as we, will fix that forfeiture on another Foundation; to wit, their *Hereſy* and *Idolatry*, that they led the People into, warranted the People to withdraw from them, as none of Chriſt's Miniſters, and diſobliged the People from owning any further Relation to them, as their Paſtors: And this not only warranted the Magiſtrate to protect thoſe that did break off from them; but to ſuppreſs them, who ſhould have done ſo, and would not. If he will not own this, he doth more to over-throw the *Reformation*, than all that he can charge *Non-conformiſts* with can amount to. We are far from queſtioning the Magiſtrates Power over Miniſters, to inflict civil Puniſhments on them; if he do it on good Grounds, he is approved of God; if otherwiſe he muſt anſwer to him for it: But our Magiſtrates do not own any power of inflicting *Church-cenſures* by themſelves; whatever ſome Flatterers do on their behalf. The Objection from the *Old Non-conformiſts*, I have anſwered above. By what hath been ſaid it will appear, whether he ſaith truly, p. 137. *That not one word of our Plea, but might equally ſerve the Papiſts.*

Sect. 18. What followeth, p. 137, 138, and 139. of the Peoples

Power

Power of chuſing their Paſtors, and the Nullity of their Title to that Charge without the Peoples Conſentt, he Dr. it ſeems thinks that *Recitaſſe* is *Refutaſſe*, for he ſaith no more to diſprove it, but Aſſerteth, That *it layeth a Foundation for all imaginable Diſorders, and Separations*; which we deny: And enough I have ſaid above to evince the contrary. He maketh another of our Grounds of *Separation* to be, the Perſecution of the *Prelatiſts*, and their having a Hand in ſilencing of Miniſters: This we diſown. Indeed their Perſecution for our not ſubmitting to their Impoſitions, is a Barr by which we are forcibly kept out of the *Church*; but it is not the motive that determineth us to leave the *Church*; we are willing to wait on Gods Ordinances even Adminiſtred by them that perſecute us, if they will ſuffer us to do it on ſinleſs Terms. And if Mr. *B.* (whom he only citeth in this matter) mean any thing elſe, I cannot anſwer for him.

SECT. III.

Of the Terms of Communion impoſed by the Church.

AFter Examination of other Pleas for *Non-conformity*, the Dr. cometh *Sect.* 13. to examine that which he confeſſeth to be *the moſt colourable Plea that hath yet been uſed*; *to wit, their impoſing of unlawful Terms of Communion with them.* And this I look on as not only the moſt colourable Plea; but is the *cauſa ſine quo non*, that without which no *Separation* can be made from a *True Church*, which is found in the Faith, without Sin; and as the very Foundation of that Cauſe that I now plead: and if the Dr. can beat us out of this Hold, we ſhall become his willing Proſelites. Let us hear then how he taketh this Plea from us.

Sect. 2. His firſt aſſault is by a diſtinction, which is really true, but very ill managed, tho' by a moſt Learned hand; but the Dr. being Maſter of ſo much Learning, as few men are, doth, I ſuppoſe, ſometimes make him conſider leſs what he writeth, than they find need to do, who move in an inferiour Orb. His diſtinction is, between *terms of Communion plainly and in themſelves ſinful*; and *ſuch as are only fanſied to be ſo through Prejudice and wilful Ignorance, or Error of Conſcience.* That there are ſome *Terms of Communion* with a *Church* really

really ſinful, and others that are not ſo, tho' they be fanſied by ſome to be ſo, I think none ever doubted; and therefore the Dr. might have better imployed his pains (to ſay nothing of his Ink and Paper) that he hath taken to prove this by a multitude of inſtances. And I grant, that when the ſinfulneſs of the *Terms* is only fanſied, the Sin of *Schiſm*, that followeth on that apprehenſion, lieth not on the *Impoſers*, but on thoſe that *ſeparate*: Only I muſt add an Exception of a Caſe in which it may lie on both; that is, when the thing impoſed is unneceſſary, and is made a ground of *Separation* by the miſtake of perſons otherwiſe orthodox and ſober, and who pretend to no other cauſe of *Separation*: If the Impoſers will not yield in that caſe, (that is the wiſer to the more wilful) they ſhew not that moderation, nor love to Peace that they ſhould. If the *Quakers* could be gained by forbearing preaching by an Hour-glaſs, (the Dr's. inſtance) I would think it hard to loſe them for that, for whom Chriſt loſt his Life.

Sect. 3. As the Dr. manageth this diſtinction, it is hard to tell what to make of it; for he confoundeth two things that are moſt diſtinct, yea, different; to wit, *Terms of Communion plainly ſinful*, and *Terms of Communion in themſelves ſinful*: And in the other *Lemma* of the diſtinction, he hath ſet nothing in oppoſition to *plainly*; for *fanſied* to be ſinful through Prejudice, wilful Ignorance, Error of Conſcience, are all oppoſite to thoſe that are ſinful in themſelves. He ſhould then have told us, if *Terms of Communion* impoſed be ſinful in themſelves, but not plainly, but only obſcurely ſo; what cenſure he would paſs on them that could not comply with them; alſo what degree of plainneſs he would require about the ſinfulneſs of impoſed *Terms of Communion*, that it might be lawful to *Separate*, rather than yield to them. My opinion is, that if *Terms of Communion* be impoſed, that are in themſelves, and really ſinful, and if the ſinfulneſs of them can be known by diligent ſearching of the Scripture, and depending upon God for Light and Guidance, tho' there be not ſuch plainneſs as the Dr. had above called *glaring Evidence*, that all the world may ſee, they that are conſciencious ought to withdraw from any *Church* whatſoever, rather than ſubmit to thoſe *Terms*. There is an Ambiguity in the Term that he uſeth, *In themſelves ſinful*; for I know, that it is their uſual Plea for the *Ceremonies*, (the impoſed *Terms of Communion* now under debate) that they are things *in themſelves* indifferent. This may either be underſtood, that they are in their general nature ſuch, which we

grant; Habits, and Poſtures, and Geſtures importing neither good nor evil, as ſuch: Or as conſidered under the circumſtances that they are cloathed with, as they fall under our debate; and ſo we think them ſinful. Now, the Dr. ſhould have told us whether he meaneth of *Terms of Communion*, that are things impoſed, which are really evil, under the circumſtances with which they are impoſed; or *Terms of Communion*, which are things in their general nature evil: We think the ſinfulneſs of *Terms of Communion*, even in the former, and not only in the latter ſence, may warrant our withdrawing.

Sect. 4. He telleth us, That the *Magiſtrate* or *Church* may lawfully determine and impoſe Time and Place, and ſuch-like circumſtances of Worſhip; which we grant, (tho' we think it inconvenient to be rigorous in theſe Impoſitions, or too frequent and univerſal in them; but about theſe, our Queſtion is not converſant:) *Therefore, if any Separate from theſe Impoſitions*, he ſaith, *the Sin of Separation is on their part:* This we do not deny. We alſo grant his Hypothetick Propoſition that followeth; to wit, *If other things be as much in the Magiſtrate or Church's Power, they ſin who ſeparate, becauſe of impoſing of them.* His reaſon of this is not ſo clear; to wit, *Where there is no plain prohibition, men may with ordinary Care and Judgment ſatisfie themſelves of the lawfulneſs of the things required: And there is no plain prohibition*, he ſaith, *of the Liturgy and Ceremonies.* We deny the impoſing the *Liturgy and Ceremonies* to be as much in mens power as is the determining of Circumſtances of Time and Place, and ſuch-like. We deny alſo, that men, with the beſt Care and Judgment, can ſee the lawfulneſs of every thing impoſed in the Worſhip of God, (for of ſuch things we now diſcourſe) that is not plainly prohibited: For, What if they be prohibited, tho' not plainly? It is too great peremptorineſs, to take upon us to teach the Spirit of God how to ſpeak in Scripture; if He expects Obedience from us (the Dr. was in this ſtrain alſo in his *Irenicum*;) if we have any hint of His Will, tho' never ſo obſcurely, ſo as we can underſtand that it is the Mind of God, we are obliged to obey it. Again, we deny, that want of either obſcure or plain Prohibition is good ground to ſatisfie us about *Religious Ceremonies*, that they are lawful, though impoſed by men: It is enough, that they are not commanded nor inſtituted. *Will Worſhip* is condemned in Scripture; and, Can it be denied, that what is not commanded, tho' it be not *plainly forbidden*, is *Will-Worſhip?* And, What Argument will the

Dr.

Dr. bring againſt moſt of the *Popiſh Ceremonies*, but that they are not commanded? Where is the plain Prohibition of them?

Sect. 5. Further, we ſay, That the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* are plainly enough forbidden, tho not in particular, yet in general terms. The Traditions of men in Gods Worſhip, are plainly forbidden, *Mat.* 15. 7, 8, 9. *Mark* 7. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 9, 10, 11. *Col.* 2. 20.---- which Scriptures, and other Arguments proving them to be forbidden by God, have been ſo fully managed againſt his Party, without any Anſwer, as may let the world ſee, that neither *Ordinary Care* nor *Judgment* hath been wanting to find out the lawfulneſs of ſuch Impoſitions; and yet we cannot find it. I ſhall not now repeat what I have elſewhere ſaid to this purpoſe, but intend to anſwer what the Dr. will pleaſe to ſay in defence of theſe his *Lawful Impoſitions.*

Sect. 6. The Dr. is at ſome pains to prove, that the prohibition of theſe is not in the Second Commandment: But if he would have convinced us of our Error, he ſhould have proved, that they are neither forbidden there, nor elſewhere, by giving ſatisfying Anſwers to all our other Arguments; but he is pleaſed to inſiſt only on our Argument from the *Second Commandment*, and to that as he is pleaſed to frame it, he giveth an Anſwer, ſuch as it is. I obſerve ſome miſtakes in his treating of this Argument; 1. That he expecteth that the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* ſhould have been forbidden in words, if they be forbidden; that is, that they ſhould have been expreſly named. Will he forbear no Sin, but what is named in one of the Ten Commandments? What will he ſay of *Fornication, Inceſt, Rebellion againſt Kings, &c.* May be he will ſay theſe are forbidden expreſly in other parts of Scripture. *Anſ.* So are *humane Inventions* in God's Worſhip; as hath been ſhewed: And beſide, it were impertinent to deny *Fornication* to be forbidden in the Seventh Commandment, becauſe it is not named there, tho' it be in other Scriptures: Even ſo it is here; yea, I ſuppoſe the Dr. will not think, that whatever is not named in Scripture as a Sin, is no Sin; miſpending the Sabbath day in *ſleep, idleneſs, play, &c.* adviſing or commanding one man to murder another, and many things of that nature, are not named in Scripture, and yet comprehended under general prohibitions.

Sect. 7. 2. His Queſtion is very abſurd, *How ſhall we come by the ſence, but by the words?* He muſt mean the words of the *ſecond Commandment.* And then I anſwer, That we could never by this

way know the ſence of the *ſeventh Commandment*, Fornication is a Sin: Nor by the words of the ſixth Commandment could we know it is a Sin, to ſay to our Brother, *Thou fool.* Wherefore hath the Spirit of God written ſo much more Scripture holding forth Sins and Duties, if we are only to look to the bare words of the Ten Commandments, for learning the preceptive or directive part of His revealed Will? *His Commands are exceeding broad*, *Pſ.* 119.96. and therefore we are to look for more underſtanding from them, than the words by themſelves can afford us. *Ezra* and the *Levites* read the words to the People, and *gave the Sence*, *Neh.* 8.8. It is our Duty alſo to read it, and enquire into the ſence of it. One uſeful means of coming by the ſence of the Commandments, is, to conſider how they were expounded by Chriſt, enlarged on by the Prophets and Apoſtles injoining and forbidding things of the ſame nature, with what the words of the Commands do expreſs; and in general, we muſt compare Scripture with Scripture, if we would underſtand the meaning of the ſeveral parts of it. It is ſtrange, that the Dr. and his Party ſhould deal ſo unequally; they take a great deal of Liberty to impoſe things on the *Church* of God, from a very general Command, *Let all things be done decently and in order:* Which words they practiſe upon at their pleaſure, deviſing *Rites* for the Worſhip of God, and bringing This to warrant them, tho' they can bring no ſuch ſence out of the words, as that *Croſſing*, *Kneeling*, *&c.* are lawful: But if we ſcruple any of their Inventions, we muſt be obliged to give words of Scripture, where they are expreſly forbidden.

Sect. 8. In the Third place; When his oppoſites alledge certain Rules for interpreting the Commandments, he asketh, *Whether they be divine or humane?* I again ask him, Whether doth he own them as ſound, or reject them as fallacious? But to his queſtion I anſwer; They are by men collected out of the Scripture, and therefore have Divine Authority, tho' the frame of them be Humane; as the Dr's Sermons (I do not mean that at *Guild-hall*) are divine Truths, and of divine Authority, tho' of humane frame and compoſure. 4. One of theſe Rules is, *That where any thing is forbidden, ſomething is commanded.* We chuſe, after the generality of Divines, rather to expreſs it thus; That in every Negative Precept the contrary Duty is commanded: And in the Affirmative Precept, the contrary Sin is forbidden. His Anſwer is, *There is here a Command to worſhip God without an Image.* A Logician would ſay, this is ſtill a Negative Command, for here the matter of this Precept is expreſſed

Negative...

Negative. All Proteſtant Divines agree, that the matter of the *Second Command* is the *modus* of Divine Worſhip, Divine Worſhip it ſelf being commanded, and what is contrary to it forbidden in the *Firſt Commandment.* Now, though this preceptive propoſition of the Dr's, *Worſhip God*, be ſet down *affirmative*, yet the manner how God is to be worſhipped, is ſet down *negative*; and therefore he hath yet given us no Duty commanded in the *ſecond Commandment*, but only the way of worſhipping God by an Image forbidden, (which he ſhunneth to ſay) or we muſt ſeek for ſome other way to expreſs the affirmative part of this Commandment.

Sect. 9. We may then conclude, that it is injoined in this Command, That we ſhould worſhip God in the way that He hath preſcribed to us in His Word. This is elſewhere commanded, *Exod.*25. 9, 40. and the contrary is ſeverely reproved, *Iſa.*66.3. *Jer.* 7. 31. From all theſe places it is evident, that God is to be worſhipped according to his own Inſtitution, and no otherwiſe: And I hope the Dr, will not diſſent from the generality of Divines, who hold, that all Sins and Duties held forth in other places of Scripture, are reducible to one of the Commandments. And to which of them can this duty of worſhipping God by the preſcript of His VVord, be reduced, if not to the *ſecond?* Hence we conclude, that the affirmative part of the *ſecond Commandment* is, that we ought to worſhip God in the way that He himſelf hath preſcribed in the Word. And if the *Dr.* can make it appear, that the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* are preſcribed there, whether plainly or obſcurely, directly or by conſequence, we ſhall own them. 5. Whereas we ſay, that it is a prohibition comprehended in the *ſecond Commandment*, That we muſt worſhip God by our own Inventions. He ſaith, *No Inventions are condemned in the Worſhip of God, but ſuch as God Himſelf hath ſomewhere forbidden; but He hath no where forbidden the Liturgy and Ceremonies.* The meaning of this muſt be, a general prohibition of humane Inven ions is not ſufficient; but notwithſtanding, that they are generally forbidden, Men may deviſe, and bring into God's worſhip, and impoſe on others what they pleaſe, if that in particular be not forbidden by a particular precept wherein it is named, or otherwiſe particularized. VVhat a mad expoſition of the *ſecond Commandment* is this? He might as well ſay, when it is ſaid, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, I may, for all that, kill any man I pleaſe, if there be not a particular command not to kill ſuch a man. Are there particular prohibitions of the ſeveral *Ceremonies* that were uſed in *Popery*? or, Muſt the Bible have been made

ſo

ſo voluminous, as to mention every circumſtantiate Caſe, otherwiſe we will take no notice of its general Precepts? Is not this *ſtretching and forcing of Scripture to defend a bad Cauſe*, which he below chargeth us with?

Sect. 10. The *Dr.* (as conſcious to the inſufficiency of this ſhift) cometh in the Fifth place to excuſe the *Ceremonies* from falling under the *ſecond Command*, by telling us of two ſorts of humane Inventions forbidden in it, and no other. 1. *Such as go about to repreſent God, and ſo to diſparage Him:* For, he ſaith, the reaſon of the law, to wit, *the ſpiritual and inviſible nature of God*, extendeth only to theſe. *Anſ.* 1. It ſeems then, worſhipping God by or before a *Crucifix*, is not here forbidden, for that doth not go about to repreſent or diſparage God, but only to repreſent CHRIST as Man. The ſame may be ſaid of all the uſe of the Images of Saints in the worſhip of God that is among the *Papiſts*; that is, they are all innocent by this Doctrine: For, if theſe be not forbidden in the *ſecond Commandment*, the Dr. will find it hard to refute theſe practices from Scripture. If ſuch a paſſage had dropt from the Pen of a *Non-conformiſt*, how would the Dr. have improved it againſt the whole Party, as doing the *Papiſts* work for them; as he hath charged them on far leſs grounds than this is? *Anſ.* 2. Seeing other waies of uncommanded VVorſhip are condemned in Scripture, as hath been ſhewed, what reaſon is there to ſay, that this way of it alone is here meant? This is to expound Scripture *ad libitum*, and amplifie or reſtrain it as our fancy or intereſt leadeth us. *Anſ.* 3. I deny not the ſpiritual and invisible nature of God to be a good Reaſon of this Law; but I deny it to be either the ſole reaſon of it, or the reaſon of it that is expreſt in the Law it ſelf; which is, that *He is a jealous God, and will puniſh the corrupters of His Worſhip.* Now this Reaſon of the Law doth evidently extend to all waies of worſhipping Him that He hath not injoined, making bold to worſhip Him in any of theſe ways, being a derogation from that ſoveraignty that He hath over Men, eſpecially in His own VVorſhip, which hath a nearer dependance on His Inſtitution than other things have.

Sect. 11. The other ſort of humane Inventions that he will exempt from the ſcope and ſence of this Commandment, is, *Such as relate to the manner and form of Worſhip, ſuppoſing the Worſhip it ſelf to be performed in a way agreeable to the Divine Nature and Law.* *Anſ.* 1. I deſire to know of the Dr. what difference he maketh between the *manner* or *form* of Worſhip, and the *way* of Worſhip; when

when he ſuppoſeth the *way* of it to be agreeable to the Divine Nature and Law; while yet the Controverſie is, whether the *manner* and *form* of it be ſo. This is a ſubtilty that I cannot reach; but Words muſt ſerve to palliate a bad Cauſe when Reaſon cannot defend it. Will then the Dr. ſay, that the *way* of Divine Worſhip is injoined in this Command, but not the *manner* and *form* of it? I hope he will not deny; that the object of worſhip is fixed in the *firſt Commandment*, and alſo the way of it, ſo far as by that word is expreſſed, the duties of natural worſhip, the inward affections and actings of the Soul on God, that are requiſite in His Worſhip. Wherefore, if he will (with all Divines, except *Papiſts* and ſome *Lutherans*) allow this to be another Precept, and not a part or explication of the firſt; he muſt ſay, that here is appointed all inſtituted worſhip; that is, all the *means*, *manner*, *external forms and ways*, by which the Lord will have us to worſhip him; to wit, that we ſhould make nor deviſe none of them to our ſelves: And this he was pleaſed to expreſs by the moſt abſurd and moſt common way that Men had deviſed to themſelves to worſhip God by, to wit, *Images*; as, in the reſt of the Negative Precepts, he uſeth to expreſs all the ſins included in it, by one that is more notable than the reſt. *Anſ.* 2. I hope the Dr. will not deny, that moſt of the *Popiſh Ceremonies*, as *Oil*, *Salt*, *Spittle*, *&c.* are forbidden in this Commandment, (or, if he do deny it, let him tell us where they are forbidden, or whether they be forbidden any where, or not) but they pertain to the *manner* and *form* of worſhipping God, as well as our *Ceremonies* do. Further, let him tell us whether it is poſſible there ſhould be any *Superſtition* in the *manner* and *form* of worſhip; and if there be, where is it forbidden, but in this Commandment? Or, let him give us any reaſon why *Humane Inventions*, relating to the *manner* and *form* of worſhip, are not forbidden, as well as theſe that relate to the *way* of it. A Reaſon indeed he pretendeth to give, *Otherwiſe* (ſaith he) *all Uſe of Mens inventions, as to preaching, reading, interpreting Scripture, would be forbidden; and then this interpretation of the ſecond Command would be unlawful, becauſe it is a meer invention of Man, as much as Liturgies and Ceremonies.* If this be to reaſon like a Divine, or to quibble like a Sophiſter, let the Reader judge; for the Invention that men make uſe of in preaching, *&c.* is the act or exerciſe of their faculties, whereby they find out the mind of God: The *inventions* in God's worſhip, that we now debate about, are Objects found out by Men, not commanded

by

by God. If Men deviſe unrevealed Objects in Reading, Preaching, *&c.* we condemn them in that, as well as in deviſing ways of worſhipping God: And if the Dr. mean, that this expoſition of the *ſecond Commandment* is an *invention* of Man, that is, the exerciſe of his *inventive Faculty*, whereby he findeth out the Mind of God; he ſpeaketh wide from the purpoſe, when he compareth that with things that men deviſe to worſhip God by: If he mean, That the Interpretation is only deviſed, not warranted; let him prove that, and we ſhall reject it.

Sect. 12. I hope, by this time, the impartial Reader may judge whether we *ſtretch and force Scripture* to condemn *Liturgies* and *Ceremonies*, as the Dr. ſaith; or he doth ſo to defend them. That he imputeth to us, *blinding and fettering our minds by Education, and reading but one ſort of Books, and taking things for granted, which we ought not*, we reſolve to bear patiently, and muſt accept of theſe, inſtead of better Arguments, to refute our Principle. His inſtance of the deniers of Infant-Baptiſm, proveth fully, that the *Schiſm* doth not alwaies lie on the Impoſer's ſide, (tho' they *ſeparate* from us, becauſe of our uſing it, without conſidering impoſing it on them. VVho of them have been excommunicated for not uſing it, as we are for forbearing the *Ceremonies*?) If men will *ſeparate*, becauſe the Ordinances of God are *impoſed* on them, let them anſwer it; we ſcruple only the Ordinances of Man: Neither did we ever ſay, that the blame of *ſeparation* doth in all caſes lie on the Impoſers. And we confeſs, that where *impoſed Terms of Communion* are ſcrupled through miſtake, they that *ſeparate* on that ſcruple do ſin. And we yield alſo to him, that not the pretence of Conſcience, but ſufficient proof of the unlawfulneſs of the *Terms of Communion*, is a good ground of *Separation*; and we ſtill deſire that the matter may be put to that iſſue.

Sect. 13. He proceedeth next to ſet forth the principles of them who hold all Acts of Communion with the *Church of England* unlawful; of them he hath little to ſay, their mind (as he ſaith) being eaſily diſcovered; and we are not concerned in that opinion, and therefore ſhall not inſiſt on it. Only I ſee not on what grounds the Dr. nameth the Author of the Book called *Jerubbaal*, as one that is againſt the lawfulneſs of hearing the conforming Miniſters preach; for that Author ſaith, p. 12. of himſelf and others, whom Mr. C. had charged with Schiſm, becauſe they could not communicate with Her in the *Liturgy*, that they joined with Her in the inſtituted

ſtituted VVorſhip and ſubſtantial Ordinances of Chriſt, as *Prayer, Hearing of the Word preached, ſinging of Pſalms*, &c.

SECT. IV.

The Dr's ſtating of the Queſtion Examined, and the Queſtion truly Stated.

THE ſeveral Principles of the *Diſſenters* having been examined, the Dr. now proceedeth to ſtate the Queſtion about *Separation*. Some think this ſhould have been done before examining of the Principles on which men *ſeparate*; but the Dr. muſt uſe his own method, and we muſt follow him, in examining what he ſaith. He giveth us, *Sect.* 15. his Conceſſions, which I ſhall ſay little of, ſave to make a Remark on one or two of them. And, 1. His third Conceſſion is, *He can allow different modes of Worſhip in Cathedral and Parochial Churches, in publick and private Adminiſtrations (theſe being allowed by the Church in whoſe Communion we live:) but, What is this*, ſaith he, *to the denying of conſtant Communion with our Churches, to the chuſing of new Paſtors?* It is true, theſe are two different things; the difference is, the one is allowed by the *Church*, the other not ſo. But conſider the things in themſelves, and abſtracted from the *Churches pleaſure*, and there will appear to be as little *Uniformity* between Cathedral and Parochial Worſhip, as between their Parochial Worſhip, and that uſed in the Meetings of the *Diſſenters*. Now we gladly would know of the Dr. or any of his Party, ſeeing the *Church* can yield ſo far to Parochial Aſſemblies, as not to tie them to the ſame Modes with Cathedral Aſſemblies, becauſe they cannot go to the expence of it: And ſeeing the Church diſpenſeth with *croſſing* in private Baptiſm, why may She not condeſcend ſo far to the *Diſſenters*, who cannot for their Conſciences uſe theſe things, and ſo ſhun this Breach in the *Church*, this denying of Communion with their Churches, and chuſing of new Paſtors? Are the Conſciences of men ſo little to be regarded? or, Is it fit the Church ſhould be ſo imperious over her Members, as that She will indulge Mens Purſes, but not their Conſciences; She will diſpenſe with the ſign of the *Croſs* for Her pleaſure, but not for peoples conſciences, when they can ſhew good reaſon for what they think and make conſcience

of? This is wholly unaccountable, and very inconsistent with those high pretentions, that our Brethren make of regard to Peace and Unity.

Sect. 2. Another remark I make of his 4*th.* Concession, That *the Church alloweth a different mode of Worship to Foreign Churches set up in* England, *because they break not off Communion with the Church of* England, *as they do who were Baptized in it.* But why may not the *Church* be as kind to her own Members as to Strangers; if the *Ceremonies* be necessary, why should the neglect of them be permitted to any? If unnecessary; why should they be forced on mens Consciences, to the Rending of the *Church*? The breaking off of Communion that he talketh of, may be prevented by this Condescendency; and therefore it is most unreasonable to charge us with that as a Sin, which we are under a Necessity to do for shunning the wounding of our Consciences, and sinning against God; and which they might as easily prevent by shewing us that Favour that they shew to others. I take notice also of his 6*th.* Concession, *That it was no sinful Separation to keep up the Exercise of True Religion under* Arians, *against the will of the Magistrate: But what is this to our Case, where true Doctrine is taught?* It is very much to our Case; for the reason why the Orthodox might Worship God apart from the *Arians*---was because it had been their sin to join in corrupted Worship; though we do not equal the owning of the *Arian* Doctrine, and using the *Ceremonies*; yet we reckon the one to be Sin, as really as the other; and we may not commit a smaller Sin to enjoy Communion with a *Church*, more than we may commit a greater Sin for that end. And we are not obliged to live without the Ordinances of God, when we cannot have them with the *Church* without Sin, more than the Oxthodox were, who lived under the *Arians*.

Sect. 3. Tho' the Dr. it seems had designed this Section for stating of the Question, upon which his whole Book is founded: I see no formal Stating of it (Concessions are but preparatory to the Stating of a Controversie) except that, he saith, *he had told Mr.* B. *that all our dispute was, whether the upholding separate Meetings for Divine Worship, where the Doctrine Established, and the substantial parts of Worship are acknowledged to be agreeable to the Word of God, be a sinful Separation or not?* This is no sufficient stating of the Controversy between the *Prelatists* and *Dissenters* about *Separation*. Two things in it are not sufficiently clear; and some things needful

to

to be minded in our preſent Controverſy are left out. The Firſt thing that is not clear, is, That he will not allow any fault in Doctrine to juſtifie *Separation*, but what is in the *Eſtabliſhed Doctrine*; that is, either that which is contained in the *Churches confeſſion of Faith*, or is ſetled by Law. But it is evident there may be ſuch faults in Doctrine, as may make them that regard their Souls Health, withdraw from a *Church* which are not here comprehended; that is, when groſs Errors are commonly taught, contrary to the Doctrine contained in the Publick Confeſſion of Faith, and which is Eſtabliſhed by Law: That this is a Caſe ſuppoſeable; yea, that it ought to have been ſuppoſed with reference to our Controverſy, appeareth in that it is moſt common in *England*, for Miniſters who have ſubſcribed the 39. *Articles*, to teach Doctrines quite contrary to them; as I obſerved above: It is no rarity for unconſcientious men, to ſubſcribe to whatever is impoſed, rather than loſe a Benefice; and mean while to Hold and Teach what they pleaſe notwithſtanding of ſuch Subſcription. Now if a *Church* ſhould become ſo corrupt, that Hereſie is commonly taught, though the Orthodox Faith be Eſtabliſhed; ought not People to withdraw from that *Church*? Or if many teach dangerous Doctrine contrary to eſtabliſhed Truth; ought not People withdraw from ſuch Teachers? Eſpecially when there is no way to get this unſound teaching removed, or reſtrained.

Sect. 4. Another thing in the Dr's State of the Queſtion is unclear; to wit, That where the ſubſtantial parts of Worſhip are acknowledged to be right, there ſhould be no *Separation*. What he meaneth by theſe is a Controverſy it ſelf; and he is at a great deal of Pains to clear what he meaneth by this Term, *Part.* 3. p. 334. whither I referr the Debate with him about it. But, what if any part of Worſhip be unlawful; call it *Subſtantial*, or *Circumſtantial*, or what he will? Or what if ſomething be Annexed to the True Worſhip of God; which is ſinful; but yet ſo peremptorily impoſed, as none ſhall worſhip God without it? I ask the Dr. whether in this caſe we may *ſeparate*, though we ſcruple not any part of that worſhip that he is pleaſed to call *Subſtantial Worſhip*?

Sect. 5. Some things are alſo left out by the Dr. in his Stating of the Controverſy, which were needful to have been minded. As, 1*ſt*. To clear what he meaneth by *Separation*. I have above ſhewed, that ſometimes they that are charged with *Separation*, are meerly Paſſive in it; ſometimes they are Active: The Firſt is when

the *Church* casteth them out, because they cannot submit to her Impositions. The Second, when they take offence at something in the *Church*, and therefore leave her; but are not cast out by her, but have free and peaceable Access to all her Ordinances: In the first Case (which is ours) if they causlesly scruple at the Impositions, they may be charged with Ignorance, or Errour of Conscience, or Peevishness, and Willfulness; but how they can be charged with *Separation*, I know not, more than a Banished Man can be blamed as a Fugitive from his Country. And if they have good cause to scruple the Impositions; I see not how any blame can be fixed on them at all. 2. He should have shewed whether by *Separation* he meaneth casting off all ties to have Communion with that *Church*, more than with another *Church* that professeth the true Faith; as a Man, or Company that live in *Holland*, have no more Tie to Communicate in *England* than in *France*, &c. or a present forbearing of Communion, because of sinful *Terms*, with owning an Obligation to communicate with this *Church*, when these Bars shall be removed. In the one case all relation to that *Church* in particular is cast off, in the other not so: It is but a suspending the Exercise of Communion as a Church-member; not a disowning it, or casting it off.

Sect. 6. He is defective in mentioning no other alledged grounds of *Separation*, but false Doctrine Established, or wrong substantial parts (as he calleth them) of Worship. He knoweth little of the Controversy that he manageth, if he knew not that other grounds are alledged; and therefore it had been fair to have fixed the Question on them; whether it be lawful to *separate* on such and such grounds. It is true, his question may include all the grounds that can be alledged, beside the two mentioned; but that which is the main Hinge of our Controversy, should have been mentioned, in stating of the Question. 4. It being confessed on both Hands, that there is a sinful *Separation*; it should have been one part of his question, where the Sin of this *Separation* is chargeable; whether on the Imposers, or the Scruplers of those things that cause the *Separation*? But he is willing to set his *Church* beyond all imaginable blame, and to put the Question only, whether the *Dissenters* have any blame, or not? 5. It should not have been omitted, to enquire whether the Grounds alledged for *Separation* lie in things really Evil, or only fancied to be such? And again, whether the Evil of them be such as will bear the weight of *Separation*.

Sect.

Sect. 7. I ſhall then endeavour to ſtate the Queſtion more fully and clearly than the Dr. hath done. There are indeed divers queſtions, on which this queſtion about *Separation* doth depend; and therefore our Controverſy cannot be repreſented in one ſingle queſtion, to which an Affirmative or Negative Anſwer will ſuffice. It is then, 1. A great part of our Controverſy, ſeeing the *Liturgy* as to the Frame of it, and *Ceremonies* are by the Clergy thought indifferent, and ſo unneceſſary, That God may be acceptably Worſhipped without them, and the Diſſenters think them unlawful to be uſed, and are able to make it appear by good reaſon, that it is not Humour but Conſcience that moveth them ſo to think; whether they ſhould impoſe theſe on the Diſſenters, and ſo force them either to *ſeparate* or ſin againſt their Conſciences. 2. It is a part of our Controverſie, and that indeed on which it mainly hangeth; whether to worſhip God by the *Liturgy*, and with the *Ceremonies*, be a Worſhip acceptable to him; or ſuch as he will reject. If he will approve them to be acceptable Worſhip; yea, lawful to be uſed; all our other queſtions will ceaſe. 3. Suppoſing them to be unacceptable worſhip, as the *Non-conformiſts* believe; and ſuppoſing them to be ſo impoſed by the *Church*, as we cannot enjoy God's Ordinances without them with the *Church*: The queſtion is, whether we ſhould chuſe to uſe them, or forbear the Ordinances with the *Church*? 4. It is yet another queſtion; ſuppoſing the unlawfulneſs of uſing them, and impoſſibility of joining with the *Church* without them; whether we ought to live without the Ordinances of God; or keep *ſeparate Meetings*, where we may enjoy God's Ordinances without ſinful mixtures of Man's inventions? I deny not but ſeveral other queſtions may fall in, while we are debating theſe; but theſe are the main points in difference between our Brethren and Us. Some have not unfitly, though not ſo fully, comprized all the Controverſie in this queſtion; whether we ought to worſhip God, only according to the Preſcript of his Word, or may do it by the Traditions of Men?

SECT.

SECT. V

The Dr's Arguments examined for Occaſional Communion.

HAving Stated the Queſtion, he is reſolved to make the charge of *Separation* againſt all the *Diſſenters*: And *1ſt.* againſt thoſe that deny *conſtant Communion* to be a Duty, where-ever *Occaſional Communion* is lawful. 2. Againſt them that hold all *Communion* with the *Church of England* unlawful. He inſiſteth on the *1ſt. Sect. 16. &c.* There was here alſo need of clear ſtating of this queſtion; which I have done above; and here reſume it briefly: *Occaſional Communion* is either in ſome Duties, or in all Duties; and ſo is *conſtant Communion.* I hope he doth not mean, that they who think it lawful to communicate with the *Church* in ſome Ordinances, as Preaching, Prayer, *&c.* are conſequently to that obliged to think it lawful to Communicate with them in all Ordinances; becauſe they have annexed unlawful *Terms of Communion* to ſome Ordinances, and not to others. The Queſtion then is, whether they who becauſe they cannot enjoy all the Ordinances without Sin in the Publick Aſſembly, and yet think they may enjoy ſome of them without Sin; and have for enjoying all God's Ordinances without Sin, ſet up a Meeting apart from the *Church* for that end: whether I ſay ſuch are obliged conſtantly to attend theſe Ordinances in the Publick Aſſembly, where there is no Sin in their joining in. To make the thing plainer by Inſtances; we may lawfully hear Sermons by the *Conformiſts*; and do not ſhun to do it occaſionally; but they have annexed ſuch unlawful *Terms of Communion* to the *Sacraments*; and ſometimes even to their Preaching, by their *ſecond Service* at the end, as well as the firſt at the beginning, that we cannot at all enjoy the *Sacraments*; and but ſeldom other Ordinances, in purity; and therefore are forced to have Meetings where we may enjoy all the Ordinances in purity. Now the Queſtion is, whether in that caſe we are obliged conſtantly to wait on Preaching in the Publick Aſſembly, rather than in our private Meetings. The Dr. is for the Affirmative; we are for the Negative.

Sect. 2. Before I examine what the Dr. ſaith for his opinion; I ſhall in a few words lay down the Grounds on which we deny any ſuch obligation to lie on us. 1. We are caſt out of their *Church*

by

by *Excommunication*; all of us being *Excommunicated ipso facto*, on our *Non-conformity* by the Canon as the Dr. confeſſeth; though he labour to palliate the Matter, *Præf.* P. 74. and *Part.* 3. P. 367. And many of us; yea, moſt of us in many places *Excommunicated* by Name; and Proſecuted with ſuch Severities, that we may not be ſeen in Publick: It is ſtrange that they ſhould caſt us out of their Communion, and at the ſame time blame us for forbearing their Communion. 2. This partial Communion that the Dr. would have us conſtantly uſe, can neither ſatisfie the Laws of the State (which he layeth ſo much ſtreſs on in *Church-matters*) nor of the *Church*: There is no Law for hearing of Sermons; but only for waiting on the *Service* and *Sacraments*; from which they have excluded us by their Impoſitions. Why then ſhould they blame us for forbearing that Communion with them, which themſelves lay ſo little weight on, while they have excluded us from that which they count *Church-Communion*, ſo as the Dr. himſelf reckoneth hearing a Sermon not to be? 3. Being by their unlawful Impoſitions neceſſitated to have Meetings and Paſtors for Adminiſtration of all God's Ordinances; we think our ſelves more obliged to wait conſtantly on hearing of the VVord in thoſe Meetings, and from thoſe Paſtors; than in the Aſſemblies, which we are ſo neceſſitated to leave, or rather are driven from, for a time.

Sect. 3. In order to proving his opinion about *Occaſional Communion*, the Dr. undertaketh to make out. 1. That *bare Occaſional Communion doth not excuſe from the Guilt of Separation.* 2. *That as far as Occaſional Communion with our Church is allowed to be lawful, conſtant Communion is a Duty.* The Firſt of theſe we are little concerned to diſpute with him; we bring other Grounds to clear our ſelves of the Guilt of *Separation*, that he layeth on us: Neither do I ſee how that by it ſelf could do it. If we have no cauſe to forbear conſtant Communion, we cannot ſatisfie the Obligation that lieth on us to the Unity of the *Church*, by Communion with her now and then. It is no wonder that the *Presbyterians* (as he ſaith) *were not ſatisfied with Occaſional Communion granted to them by the Diſſenting Brethren*, becauſe they ſaw no juſt cauſe of their denying *conſtant Communion*; which if we cannot ſhew in our caſe, we are indeed faulty. I have above ſhewed how we are Members of the *Church*, and how not: And do not plead that *Occaſional Communion* maketh one a *Member*, but I hope it will not be denied, but that, with proteſtation of the Grounds on which we own it, will ſhew

that

that we do not caſt off all ſort of *Memberſhip* with the *Church*; and it may excuſe from the *tantum*, though not from the *totum* of *Separation*, as I believe it did in the *Independants*, compared with the *Browniſts*, in reference to the *Presbyterians*, which the Dr. inſtanceth. For his diſcourſe againſt Mr. *B.* for being Eighteen years without Adminiſtring or receiving the Sacrament, and yet Preaching, What Evil is in it, or in other inſtances of this nature, will be charged on his Party, who deprive us of the Ordinances of the Lord with them, by their ſinful *Impoſitions*; and do what they can to hinder us from having them otherwiſe, by their *Perſecutions*; many things of that nature are our Affliction, and their Sin; but all this cannot oblige us to Communicate with them in their Corruptions of God's Worſhip.

Sect. 4. I leave our Author to make the beſt he can of his firſt undertaking, and come to attend him in his ſecond; to wit, That *conſtant Communion is a Duty, where Occaſional Communion is lawful.* This he manageth, *Sect.* 17. Mr. *B.* and Mr. *A.* had given good inſtances to diſprove this, as it is here ſet down; to wit, joining with other Pariſhes in a Journey, at a Lecture, *&c.* but I am willing to underſtand it, with the Dr. of Communion with a *Church*, whereof we have been or ſhould be *Members*; and of withdrawing from a Church for ſome Corruptions; where yet I may *Occaſionally* join in ſome duties; for his opinion in this, he bringeth two Arguments; the firſt he taketh from *the general Obligation upon Chriſtians to uſe all lawful means for preſerving the Peace and Unity of the Church.* This he inforceth, by proving this Obligation; which none of us ever denied; but do with more reaſon retort all that can be ſaid, on that head, on themſelves, who will not do what they can for this Peace and Unity; they will not quit ſo much as one of their needleſs *Ceremonies*: For our part we are ready to do what we can without Sin for Peace and Unity; but the Dr. ſhould have proved, 1. That our coming to their Sermons, as often as there was no Let by the *Liturgy* joined with it, and when they pleaſed to ſuffer us without Excommunication, and *Capi ndo*'s, would preſerve that which he calleth *Peace and Unity*. 2. That we being neceſſitated to have other Meetings for the pure Ordinances of God; it was a lawful means for Peace and Unity with that *Church* that had driven us away, to deſert theſe Meetings, and wait on ſo much of their Adminiſtrations, as they ſhould be pleaſ d to allow us. Our Hearts do not reproach us, as this Learned Author doth, *That*

it

it is one of the provoking Sins of the Non-conformists, that they have been so backward in doing what they were convinced they might have done, with a good Conscience: He meaneth toward Communion with the *Church*.

Sect. 5. But I perceive all the Strength of his Argument, and the Zeal with which he prosecuteth it, is built on a mistake; to wit, *That we hold it lawful to Communicate with the Church in the Liturgy and Sacraments*. If Mr. *B.* or any other, are of that opinion, I know not why they should be *Non-conformists*: If I were convinced of it, I should not deny *constant Communion* with the *Church*, whatever I might do *Occasionally* elsewhere; only I think our Author need not talk so highly against his Opposites as he doth, p. 159. when they speak of some cases, where joining with the *Church*, would do more harm than good. *Was ever Schism*, saithhe, *made so light of? And the Peace and Unity of Christianity valued at so low a rate? Ans.* Yes, to wit, by them who will not part with a Trifling *Ceremony*, for the Peace that they so much talk of; but will impose these on scrupling Consciences by force, to the dividing of the *Church*, the laying aside of thousands of well qualified Ministers, and the Hazard and Ruin of many Souls. Did ever men in the World make lighter of the Peace of Christians, than these men do, if you believe their deeds, and yet value it more highly, if ye regard their words? He asketh, p. 161. Which *of them readeth what they think lawful in their own Assemblies*? *Ans.* We read part of that *Service-Book* daily in our Assemblies; to wit, the Scriptures therein contained, we read them out of the Bible; but for using the Book, or any part of it, as in that composure, we find no obligation on us to that; both because that would be very insignificant toward Unity with the *Church*, more than Preaching of the same Doctrine, and praying for the same things, is counted by them; also, we look on the whole Frame and Model of that *Service*, as a humane device, that we ought to give no Countenance to in God's Worship. And lastly, because having once parted with them, in the matter of worship; we think we should take our Rule for managing our Worship, from the Scripture, rather than from their Ecclesiastical Constitutions.

Sect. 6. All his Arguments, *Sect.* 18. do procced on the forementioned mistake; to wit, that we count Communion with them in all their Ordinances lawful: If that were true, Communion with them sometimes for peace, might well infer constant Communion

munion, for the ſame good deſign. Neither do I ſay, that *better means of Edification* will warrant conſtant *ſeparate* Aſſemblies; however it may warrant *Occaſional Communion* elſewhere, then where we are Members of a *Church*. I look not on our Lords Communion with the *Jewiſh Church*, as only *Occaſional*, but *Conſtant*, ſo far as the Work that he was ſent into the World for, did permit; but I am far from thinking that ever he did communicate with the *Jews* in any part of their uninſtituted worſhip, as the Dr. alledgeth, p. 162. *His preſence at the Feaſt of Dedication, as other Jews were*, is aſſerted by the Dr. without all Ground; and he knoweth our Writers do conſtantly deny it; and therefore his bare aſſerting it, ſhould not have been thought enough to ſet it off. All that the Scripture ſaith of this, is, That *he walked in* Solomon's *Porch*, Joh. 10. 22, 23. Did none of the *Jews* more than this, at that Feaſt? Is it not to be thought, that he who did ſo ſharply reprove their uninſtituted *Waſhings*, and other religious *Obſervations*, on account of the want of Inſtitution; and defended the *Non-conformity* of his Diſciples to theſe Obſervations; would himſelf obſerve a Religious Solemnity, that had no other warrant nor foundation, but what thoſe other things had, which he condemneth? It is then rational to think, that he walked there to get opportunity to ſpeak to the People at that concourſe; as the Apoſtles after did, when they knew theſe *Jewiſh* Feaſts to be abrogated, and not fit to be obſerved.

Sect. 7. He bringeth a Second Argument, *Sect.* 19. from *Phil.* 3. 16. *As far as we have already attained, let us walk by the ſame Rule; let us mind the ſame things*: To prove that where *Occaſional Communion* with a *Church* is lawful, *conſtant Communion* is a Duty; for, ſaith he, *from hence appeareth evident, that Men ought to go as far as they can toward Uniformity, and not to forbear doing any thing which they lawfully may do towards Peace and Unity*. This Argument is but lamely propoſed, and this Scripture but weakly improved (by what the Dr. ſaith) to prove his deſign. Two things, it ſeems, he would inferr from it; to wit, *Uniformity*, and *Study of Peace*. I firſt ask him, whether he thinketh theſe two to be neceſſarily conjoined; ſo as to ſtudy the one, is to ſtudy the other alſo; and neglecting the one, is, to neglect the other? If he ſay they are not, why doth he here conjoin them? Will not the ſtudy of Peace anſwer this injunction of the Apoſtle, without Uniformity? If he ſay they are, it is eaſie to prove the contrary; for not only we have Peace and Unity with other *Churches*, though not *Uniformity*; but

the

the *Church of England* alloweth a *Difformity* within her ſelf; to wit, between Cathedral and Parochial *Service*; and yet I hope ſhe alloweth no *Schiſm*, nor breach of Unity; or, will the Dr ſay, that the Apoſtle here injoineth *Uniformity* among all particular Aſſemblies in a *Church*, except in Cathedrals? I confeſs it is like he did not mind their *Uniformity*, for he knew no ſuch diſtinction of Churches, or Officers, on whom it dependeth, under the New Teſtament.

Sect. 8. I ask, Secondly, what ſort of *Uniformity* doth he think the Apoſtle doth here injoin; if in Doctrine, inſtituted Worſhip, Holy Converſation, and ſuch like: I grant it to be our Duty to ſtudy it; But if in the ſame Forms and Words of Prayer, in the ſame religious inſtituted *Ceremonies*; yea, or in all the ſame Circumſtances, let him prove that the Apoſtle meant any ſuch thing; for we deny it: And it is generally held, that the Ancient *Church* (which the Dr. thinks could not poſſibly ſo ſoon degenerate from Apoſtolick practice) was very various, and not Uniform in her Rites and Cuſtoms; as may be ſeen in *Daillie's right uſe of the Fathers*, Lib. 2. p. 148.---- but much more fully in the Dr's own *Irenicum*, p. 65, 66. *He muſt be a great Stranger to the Primitive Church, that takes not notice of the great Diverſity of Rites and Cuſtoms uſed in particular Churches, without any cenſuring of thoſe that differed from them, or if any, by inconſiderate Zeal did proceed ſo far* (as the Dr. and others now doth) *how ill it was reſented by other Chriſtians.* A great deal more to that purpoſe is excellently there ſaid: But, *O quantum mutatus ab illo*---- We deny that *Uniformity* (ſuch as that our Brethren uſe to plead ſo hotly for) was any part of the Apoſtles meaning; and therefore it ought to be no part of the Dr's Argument from this Text.

Sect. 9. I do, in the Third place, readily acknowledge, that the Apoſtle here deſigneth to engage Chriſtians, as far as they can attain, by their underſtanding of what is their Duty; and as far as they can lawfully do, to ſtudy Peace and Unity, as with all men; ſo with the *Church* of which they are Members. But how doth this prove *conſtant Communion* with the *Church* to be our duty; for if he mean *conſtant Communion* in the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*, we have not attained ſo far: We ſee not the lawfulneſs of the uſe of theſe, much leſs of the conſtant uſe of them; and therefore the Apoſtle doth not enjoin us to ſtudy Peace and Unity that way. I ſhould rather think that a concludent Argument might be brought from this Text,

to perſwade our Brethren to ſtudy the Peace and Unity of the *Church*, by not preſſing us with theſe things, nor forcing us to withdraw from the *Church*, becauſe of them; for they have attained ſo far, they know them to be indifferent, and ſo unneceſſary: They and we agree in this Attaintment; why then do we not *walk by the ſame Rule*, in laying them aſide, and *minding the ſame things*; to wit, the Unity of the *Church*, and not our own Enriching, Grandeur, and Dominion over our Brethren? But if he mean *conſtant Communion* with the *Church* in the Ordinance of Preaching, 1. That themſelves hinder, by their Excommunication. 2. That is not Duty in the Circumſtances, that their Violence hath placed us in, as hath been ſhewed. 3. That could not conduce to Peace and Unity, while we are neceſſitated to keep *ſeparate* Meetings on other accounts. So that the Apoſtle's command in this Text, doth not at all reach our caſe, and how far it reacheth the Impoſers, let them look to it.

Sect. 16. Having thus defended our cauſe from his Argument built on this Text, even ſuppoſing his own Expoſition of the Text, I ſhall not need to be concerned in what Expoſition others give of it; nor in his Refutations of them; yet I ſhall take notice of a few things in his diſcourſe on this Text, which may ſeem to make againſt our cauſe. And, 1. this Refutation of Dr. *O.* who ſaith, *That the Apoſtle underſtandeth the different Attainments of Chriſtians in knowledge; ſuppoſing which, they ſhould jointly practiſe what they know; and bear with one another in what they differed about.* To confirm this, (if it be not a Crime to make uſe of Mr. *Pool*'s Criticks, which the Dr. objecteth to Mr. *A.* the poor *Non-conformiſts* not having *Deaneries* to furniſh them with vaſt Libraries) this ſeemeth to be the general opinion of Interpreters, *gradum illum cognitionis rerum divinarum & perfectioris vitæ*, ſay *Menochius*, *Eſtius* and *Tirinus*. *In eo quod revelavit Deus*; ſaith *Zanchius*: Who, though he apply it by way of Conſequence againſt Diſſentions in the *Church*, as the Dr. alleageth, p. 176. yet doth down-right make the Apoſtle to mean of Degrees of Knowledge; and his applying it againſt Diſſentions doth not ſay, that he preſſeth Unity in Mens Devices; but in God's Truth, and Inſtitutions, which no doubt the Apoſtle doth alſo recommend. Alſo *Bullinger in loc.* (not cited by Mr. *Pool*) *Idem ſentientes, & concordibus votis, calculis, & ſtudiis progrediamur, agnitaque veritate provehamur.* Let the Dr. ſhew us one Interpreter, that expoundeth this paſſage of Studying the *Churches* Peace

by

by *Uniformity* in *Ceremonies* and *Liturgy*: I think himſelf is the firſt that hatcht that Opinion.

Sect. 11. The Dr. here, againſt Dr. *O.* diſcuſſeth three Points; the firſt is, Whether the Apoſtle ſpeaketh here of different Opinions, or of different Practices. He endeavoureth to prove the latter, becauſe *the Apoſtle beginneth with a Caution againſt them that were for Circumciſion, and maketh a digreſſion concerning himſelf; he adviſeth People to agree in purſuing their main end; and then bringeth in the Caſe of them that were not ſatisfied about the Law, that People ſhould not liſten to them, becauſe they made Diviſions among them, and divided them by different Obſervations.* This is to expound Scripture by our fancy. It is evident, that the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of *Juſtification*, which the *Conciſion* Thought muſt be, by the Works of the Law: And this he refuteth from his own practice of looking after another Righteouſneſs; but he would have them to deal tenderly with thoſe that had not yet learned the Truth, even in that great point, waiting till God ſhould inſtruct them. I ſee nothing that he ſaith to prove, that it was meant of *different Practices*, but rather of different *Opinions*, that divided the *Church*: But whether the one or the other, it proveth not, that we ſhould go over the Belly of our Light to keep Peace, but rather bear with one another for that end.

Sect. 12. Next he enquireth, *Whether the Rule here mentioned was the Rule of mutual Forbearance.* I think the Queſtion ſhould rather be, Whether it was a Rule of God's making, or of Man's making? Whatever the Rule were in particular. *Tirinus* ſaith, *Regulam hic intelligit a Chriſto & Apoſtolis ejus præſcriptam.* Zanchius, *Doctrinam quam modo tradidit ſummam doctrinæ Chriſtianæ, tum de dogmatibus, tum de moribus. Doctrinam fidei*, ſay *Eſtius* & *Menochius. Grotius* ſaith, *Etiam qui de ritibus & circumciſione aliter ſentiunt, interim ſciant, evangelij præcepta, quæ divina eſſe per ſuas ſunt ſibi eſſe ſequenda.* If the Dr. can prove this Rule to be a humane Rule, he will gain much by this Scripture, otherwiſe nothing at all. We are content to follow a Divine Rule, for attaining Peace in the *Church*; it doth indeed forbid peeviſh dividing of the *Church*, by injoining to hold to the ſame Rule; but the Dividers are not they that are content to follow all Chriſt's Rules, but they that make Rules of their own, and will tear the *Church* in pieces, rather than theſe ſhould not be obſerved. The Third thing he enquireth into is, What influence this Rule hath on our Caſe. He ſaith, *It obligeth to go as far as we*

can:

can: This is confeſſed. But then we ſay, It is a Divine, and not Humane Rule that muſt ſhew how far we can, (*i. e.*) ought to go. He ſaith, *When we can go no further, we muſt ſit down quietly, and wait for further Inſtruction, and not divide the Church. Anſ.* When the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *ver.* 15. of God's further inſtructing them that miſtake, I ſuppoſe it expreſſeth rather the hope that the ſound part ſhould have of them that are ſhort in Knowledge, which ſhould make them not over-drive them, (as our Brethren would do with us) than what is their Duty. I am far from ſaying, that it is mens Duty to break the Peace of the *Church*, but I am ſure, two things are far from being the Apoſtle's Scope, to injoin ſuch doubting Chriſtians; 1. That they ſhould go over the belly of their Light, to join with them that they differ from, either in the Principles or the Practices that they ſcruple. 2. That if they cannot have Communion in Ordinances with them, unleſs they thus ſin againſt Light, that they ſhould live without the Ordinances. None of theſe we have any Rule for in the Goſpel; and therefore doing of theſe were not walking by any Rule that the Apoſtle here meaneth. The Dr. ſaith, p. 171. *This Rule, in order to Peace, requireth the obſerving of ſuch things, which although they be not particularly appointed by God, yet are injoined by lawful Authority, and not repugnant to the Word.* I wiſh the Dr. had proved, that the Apoſtle giveth any warrant to obſerve ſuch things in the Worſhip of God; we deny it. It is fallacious to propoſe his diſtinction of things *not particularly appointed* by God, but appointed by *Lawful Authority*; but let us ſee a general Rule from the Word, for what we ſcruple, and that will ſatisfie us: Or, let us ſee what Authority Men have to appoint any thing that is *in ſtatu cultus*, or *religioſo*, that God hath not appointed. It is moſt falſly aſſerted, p. 172. that *Becauſe the Apoſtles decreed againſt a plauſible pretence of Conſcience, about abſtaining from Blood*, &c. *the Governours of the Church*, (he hath now changed the ſtile; it uſed to be, the Magiſtrate) *by parity of Reaſon, may determine thoſe things which they think conduce moſt to the peace and welfare of the Church which they are bound to preſerve:* For to give any colour of Truth to this Aſſertion, he muſt prove, 1. That ordinary Church-Governours have as much Power as the Apoſtles in ſuch Caſes. 2. That there is a parity of Reaſon for the things determined by our Church-Guides, and thoſe by the Apoſtles; theſe were neceſſary, and the Apoſtles Decree found them ſo, and had its Riſe from this *neceſſity*. The *Ceremonies* are confeſſed to be *indifferent*,

and

and to have no *neceſſity*, but what it pleaſeth the *Church* or *Magiſtrate* to give them.

Sect. 13. He ſaith, p. 173, in anſwer to another of his Oppoſers, That *the Apoſtle gave binding Rules to particular Churches, which are not extant in Scripture, as appears by* 1 Cor. 7. 17. *Anſ.* 1. This Rule is expreſly ſaid to be given in all *Churches*, not to any *Church* in particular. 2. That this Rule is not extant in Scripture, is falſe; for it is extant in this place. 3. This Rule that a man ſhould keep within his ſtation, is no prudential Rule of Order and Government, as the Dr. hinteth, but a Principle of the Moral Law. 4. We are content to ſubmit to all Rules that can be juſtly proved out of, or inferred from Scripture, tho' they be not, *in terminis*, extant there. But the Rules for *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* are none of theſe.

SECT. VI.

The Dr's Arguments againſt Independent *Separation conſidered, in ſo far as they may be thought to reach* Presbyterians.

FRom *Sect.* 21. and forward, the Reverend Author inſiſteth on the Charge of *Schiſm*, againſt thoſe that deny any Communion with the *Church of England* to be lawful; to wit, in partaking of the Ordinances with them; who deny them (tho' true *Churches* in ſome ſence) to be ſuch *Churches* as they can abide in the Communion of, and therefore muſt keep *ſeparate* Meetings, which they own as other *Churches* diſtinct from the Parochial Churches. He aimeth I ſuppoſe, eſpecially at the *Independents*; I am not of that Perſwaſion, and therefore leave the Patrociny of it to them that are. Yet becauſe many of the Dr's Arguments againſt their *Separation* may be thought by the unwary Reader to militate alſo againſt the Meetings of the *Presbyterians*, I muſt not wholly paſs over this part of his Book; but I ſhall anſwer his Arguments ſo far only, as they may be thought to condemn our Principle and Practice.

Sect. 2. Before I examine his Arguments, I ſhall ſhew two conſiderable Differences between our withdrawing from the *Church*, and that of the *Independents*. 1. They have more grounds on which they *ſeparate* than we; and conſequently, more is required to bring

them back to Communion with the *Church*, than is to bring us to it; for we withdraw, as they alſo do, becauſe of the *Liturgy*, *Croſſing in Baptiſm*, *Kneeling* in the Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, obſerving of *Holidaies*: If the *Church* will either remove theſe, or bear with us in them, we are ready to join with Her in Acts of Communion. But beſide theſe, they *ſeparate*, becauſe of the wrong Conſtitution of the *Church* in her Members, want of a right Diſcipline, faults in the election and ordination of Miniſters: Tho' the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies* were not, they would ſtill *ſeparate*, as they do from the *Presbyterian Churches*, where theſe are not. 2. They *ſeparate*, becauſe theſe are uſed; We only becauſe they are impoſed as neceſſary terms of our being admitted to Communion. They *ſeparate*, becauſe the *Church* is polluted with theſe; We only becauſe we dare not pollute our own Conſciences with them. If we may have leave but to forbear perſonal concurrence in theſe, we think the fault of other men (I mean in things of that nature) no ground for us to withdraw from the Ordinances in and with the *Church*; ſo that, in effect, They go away from the *Church*, We are driven away by the *Church*.

Sect. 3. The firſt Argument that the Dr. bringeth againſt denying Communion to the *Church*, is, *It weakneth the Cauſe of the Reformation*. This he undertaketh to prove by the teſtimony of ſome *French Divines*, and he beginneth with *Calvin*, whoſe words (too long here to be tranſcribed) do prove indeed *Separation* from a *Church* to be unlawful, becauſe of leſſer Impurities or great Faults, while the Doctrine and Worſhip are not greatly corrupted. But he ſpeaketh not one word of the Caſe of them who are driven away from a *Church*, becauſe they cannot ſubmit to ſinful *Terms of Communion* with Her: Yea; he ſpeaketh more in favour of ſuch a Caſe than againſt it; for he maketh Corruption in Chriſt's Inſtitutions (even in the words cited by the Dr. p. 181, 182.) and being *anathematized*, for not complying with theſe Corruptions, a ground of *Separation* from the Church of *Rome*, which is parallel to our caſe. *But* (ſaith the Dr.) *he doth not mean indifferent Rites*. *Anſ.* Neither do we ſcruple *indifferent Rites*, but *ſinful Ceremonies*. And tho' I am far from comparing the *Church of England* with that of *Rome*, as to cauſes of *Separation*, yet here there is a likeneſs; the one rejecteth ſome of her Members, becauſe they will not ſin with her, and will force her impoſitions on their Conſciences; and ſo doth the other. Another Author he citeth is *Daillie*, giving moſt ſubſtan-

tial

tial Reaſons for *Separation* from *Rome*; and he doth not mention our *Ceremonies* among them. And, what need was there to mention them, when there were ſuch weighty Reaſons beſide to be inſiſted on? But Monſieur *Daillie* ſaith expreſly, *if the differences had been ſuch, as we might ſafely have yielded to, then Separation had been raſh and unjuſt.* So ſay we, for we cannot yield to the leſſer ſinfulneſs of *ſuperſtitious Worſhip*, as we cannot to that which is greater, to wit, *idolatrous Worſhip*.

Sect. 4. Next he citeth *Amyraldus*, who ſaith, *If there had been no other faults in the Roman Church, beſide their unprofitable Ceremonies in Baptiſm, and other things beyond the meaſure and* genius *of Chriſtian Religion, they had ſtill continued in Her Communion.* *Anſ.* Neither ſhould we refuſe Communion with the *Church of England*, for theſe and ſuch-like faults: We refuſe the uſe of theſe, and becauſe of that, the *Church* caſteth us out of Her Communion. And if *Amyraldus* ſay, That he would have uſed theſe rather than have fallen under *Rome's anathema*, we leave him to his own Sentiments in that, but are of another opinion. It is no wonder theſe men think little or next to nothing of the Evil of our *Ceremonies*, when they are compared with theſe *Romiſh Abominations*; but when we conſider them by themſelves, and compare them with Scripture, we cannot think ſo of them. The Dr. further urgeth us, with the Anſwers given by *Claude*, *Paion*, and *Turretine*, to the Book entituled, *Prejudes legitimes contre les Calvinuſtes:* That they do not defend the *Reformation* by the unlawfulneſs of the *Ceremonies*; this is both falſe and inconcludent: It is falſe; for Monſieur *Claude* ſpendeth a good part of the Third Chapter of his Firſt Part in defending the ground and right that the *Reformers* had, to depart from the Communion of the *Romiſh Church*, becauſe of their *Ceremonies*. *One of the chief Objects* (ſaith he) *that preſented it ſelf to our Fathers, was that of the great number of the Ceremonies*; which he ſetteth forth as defacing God's Worſhip, making it look partly like *Judaiſm*, and partly like *Heatheniſm:* He ſaith, *It was, without doubt, a character very oppoſite to the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*; and much more to that purpoſe. What the other two Anſwerers of that Book ſay on this Head, I know not, for I have not ſeen them. This Argument is alſo inconcludent, becauſe the *Reformation* is abundantly defended by weightier Objections againſt *Popery*.

Sect. 5. One paſſage he citeth, p. 184. out of Mr. *Turretine*, that *no tolerable ſuperſtitious Rites, that do not infect the Conſcience, are ſufficient*

ficient grounds of Separation. And the Dr. addeth *in parentheſi, (as they cannot be where they are not forced on it by falſe Doctrine.)* To Mr. *Turretine*'s Aſſertion I aſſent; for nothing that is *tolerable* can warrant *Separation*: And I deny not, that ſome *Superſtitious Rites* may be *tolerable*; to wit, where men will uſe them, and do not impoſe them on others: They that are left to their liberty, may well *tolerate* others in the uſe of them; but I do not ſo well ſee, that any *Superſtition* impoſed is *tolerable* to a tender Conſcience; for *Superſtition* is Sin, and no Sin is *tolerable* in that caſe. To the Dr's *Parentheſis* I anſwer, That it is abſolutely falſe; and I wonder that he ſhould aſſert it ſo confidently without proof; for, (that I may not deny, as he aſſerteth, without reaſon) 1. A *Superſtitious Rite* is one of the *Traditions of Men*, in the Worſhip of God, and that the Scripture doth ſimply condemn, without all noticing of any falſe Doctrine to enforce the Tradition. I know not what falſe Doctrine the *Phariſaical Waſhings* were enforced with, but I am ſure Chriſt condemneth them without mention of any ſuch falſe Doctrine diſtinct from the aſſerting of their lawfulneſs, *Mat.* 15. 6, 9. but of this afterward. 2. May not enforcing a *Superſtitious Rite* on the Conſcience of one that ſcruples it by Command and Will, make it to defile the Conſcience, as well as enforcing it by falſe Doctrine? If this Doctrine were true, men might impoſe what they will in the Worſhip of God; they might impoſe all the Rites that ever *Jews* or *Heathens* uſed, or *Papiſts* either, if they keep but an orthodox mind, and give no reaſon that is heterodox for theſe Rites, but only *ſic volo, ſic jubeo.* To what purpoſe he citeth *le Blanch*, ſhewing the impoſſibility of re-union with the *Papiſts*, I ſee not, but that many Names of Authors make a ſhew, and it argueth great reading; for he ſaith not one word of the *Ceremonies*; and we all know, that if we would ſwallow down not only the *Ceremonies of England*, but thoſe of *Rome* it ſelf, yet Re-union with them is impoſſible on other grounds.

Sect. 6. It was needful, that the Dr. ſhould bring all this Diſcourſe and theſe long Citations, home to his purpoſe, which every Reader could hitherto hardly diſcern how it ſhould be done: Wherefore, p. 185. he telleth us what Triumphs the *Church of Rome* would make over us, if we had nothing elſe to juſtifie our *Separation* from them by, but the things that we now ſcruple. And he telleth us, how we would be laughed at, all over the Chriſtian world, and how the *Papiſts* are hardened, ſeeing no end of *Schiſm.* To

all

all this I anſwer, 1. I know *Rome*, and ſome others too, will triumph when there is no cauſe for their ſo doing; but as long as we can ſhew Scripture-warrant for what we hold and do, we are unconcerned in their cenſures. 2. That there is no cauſe, for their triumphing, appeareth, becauſe the Dr. and his Party, (who have the ſame cauſe of Triumph that the *Papiſts* could have on this occaſion) have as yet had no ſuch victory in their Debates with us, as to make them triumph. 3. If by the Chriſtian World, he mean the *Proteſtant* part of Chriſtianity, (for the reſt, we are leſs moved by their Judgments) I hope they will not laugh at us, who ſcruple nothing, but what moſt of them have condemned, as Additions to the Word of God, and Corruptions of His Worſhip; for ſo all the *Calviniſt-Churches* and Divines have done. 4. If the *Papiſts* be hardened, as ſeeing no end of *Schiſm*, they are to be blamed; for we can ſhew them, and others, a good end of it; to wit, ordering the worſhip of God by his Inſtitution; or, at leaſt, impoſing nothing uninſtituted as *Terms of Communion* with the *Church*.

Sect. 7. His Second Argument is, *Sect.* 24. That *this Separation maketh Union among the Proteſtant Churches impoſſible, ſuppoſing them to remain as they are.* This he proveth, becauſe *the Lutheran Churches have theſe and more Ceremonies, yet theſe Churches are thought true, and fit to be united with, by a Synod of the Reformed at* Charenton, 1631. *The* Helvetian *Churches declare againſt ſeparating for diffrent Rites and Ceremonies. So doth the Confeſſion of* Poland, *and that of* Ausburg, *and* Strasburg; *alſo* Crecius, *and the* Tranſilvanian *Divines.* Nothing of all this cometh up to the point as above ſtated. We allow no *Separation* for theſe Rites; and none of the Divines or Confeſſions mentioned, diſalloweth forbearing of them in our own perſons, nor injoineth uſing of them. We do not *ſeparate* becauſe the *Church* uſeth them; but She driveth us away becauſe we cannot uſe them. What he citeth out of *Amyraldus*, p. 189. that the nature of *Ceremonies* is to be taken from the Doctrine that goeth along with them, I have ſaid ſomewhat to above. I deny not, but a bad Doctrine may infect an indifferent *Ceremony*, that is built on it; but I cannot aſſent, That the beſt Doctrine can juſtifie an uninſtituted *Ceremony* in God's Worſhip. He citeth *Davenant*, giving three Reaſons that may hinder Union; and the firſt is, *Tyranny over Mens Faith and Conſcience*; let but this be removed, and our *Separation* is at an end; for I think the Dr. will hardly clear impoſing of needleſs *Ceremonies* on them that are convinced of, and can prove

their ſinfulneſs of this blame. That Proteſtant Churches abroad have harder *Terms of Communion* than we, he ſuppoſeth, p. 198. but doth not prove; the *Calviniſt Churches* have not; and if the *Lutheran Churches* have, that is, impoſe them with ſuch rigour, we cannot but, *eatenus*, condemn them: Yet we ſhut not out the *Lutheran Churches* from all poſſibility of Union with them, as he inſinuates; we can have Union with them as *Sister Churches*, but we cannot partake in their inſtituted parts of Worſhip.

Sect. 8. His third Argument is, that *this will juſtifie the ancient Schiſms that have alwaies been condemned in the Chriſtian Church; and he inſtanceth in the Schiſm of the* Novatians *and others*: But the Dr. hath done us *Presbyterians* the favour, to free us of the trouble of this Debate with him, by ſetting aſide (from their Pleas for *Separation*) *Ceremonies*, *Liturgy*, and *Holidays*, which are the things we inſiſt upon. I ſay no more on this Argument, but take notice of the Dr's wonderful but moſt groundleſs confidence in a *Parentheſis*, aſſerting, That *theſe are common to our Church, with all other Chriſtian Churches, for many hundred years before the great degeneracy of the Roman Church, and are continued by an univerſal conſent in all parts of the Chriſtian World.* The firſt part of his Aſſertion is abſolutely falſe, for all the cunning uſed in inſerting the Epithete, *great degeneracy* of the *Roman Church*; I know not where he will fix this *great degeneracy*, whether in *Boniface*'s uſurping the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, or, may be, in the *Council of Trent*: But he ſhall never prove, that theſe were uſed in the Church before a notable *degeneracy* of the *Church*; nor that they were uſed by all Chriſtians, even before the *greateſt degeneracy*. For the Second Part of his Aſſertion, it is beyond comprehenſion what he can mean by it; for he cannot be ignorant, that theſe are not continued in all, nor moſt of the *Reformed Churches*, but diſowned in their Confeſſions, and by their Practice. But ſome mens confidence, or pretence to it, runs higheſt, when Truth and Reaſon is with them at the loweſt ebb.

Sect. 9. I come now to his Fourth Argument, *Sect.* 26. That *theſe grounds will make ſeparation endleſs.* He proſecuteth this Argument in 12 pages, by ſhewing the evil of *Schiſm*, p. 197. reproving Mr. *A.* for making too light of it, p. 198. and expoſing him in a mimick long Oration, in the excuſe of it, p. 199, 200, 201, 202, 203. and citing Mr. *B.* ſetting forth the evil of *Schiſm*, p. 204, 205, 206. and reproving Mr. *A.* for *not ſetting Bounds to Separation*. All which I ſhall paſs by, as not againſt the cauſe that I maintain, and only briefly

briefly anſwer his Argument, (if either his Party, or any pretended to be on our ſide, will not keep within that Boundary, let them anſwer it) That Separation will ſoon be at an end, if the *Church* impoſe nothing but what is warranted by Scripture, and if People refuſe nothing, ſo as to *ſeparate* for it, but what they can ſhew Scripture-ground, that it were their Sin to own it or do it.

Sect. 10. His Fifth Argument is taken from *the Obligation that lieth on all Chriſtians to preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Church.* To enforce this Argument, the Dr. doth well prove ſeveral ſound truths, but ſuch as none of them, nor all of them, conclude againſt withdrawing from the *Church*, when ſinful *Terms of Communion* are impoſed; as, 1. That the Study of Unity is a Duty. 2. That this Unity doth not lie in bare Communion in Faith and Love. 3. Nothing can diſcharge us from this Obligation to ſtudy Unity, but what is allowed by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, as a ſufficient reaſon for it. What is all this, to make up an Obligation to ſin againſt God, rather than *ſeparate* from the *Church?* But a fourth thing he inſiſteth on, may be, will help him better. He telleth us of three caſes, wherein Scripture alloweth of *Separation*; to wit, *Idolatrous Worſhip, Falſe Doctrine, mens making indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation.* That this is not a ſufficient enumeration, I prove; 1. Becauſe there may be ſinful *Terms of Communion* impoſed where none of theſe are. May not men make owning Traditions of Men neceſſary to their Communion, tho' they make it not neceſſary to Salvation? and where-ever we muſt ſin or *ſeparate*, *Separation* is allowed by the Scripture, which tieth us to *live peaceably with all men, if poſſible*, and *ſo far as in us lieth:* It is not in our power to ſin, for *Illud tantum poſſumus quod jure poſſumus.* 2. The Apoſtle ſpeaketh of uſing *Ceremonies* that the Dr. calleth indifferent, as ſo dangerous to the Soul, that *Separation* is, no doubt, rather to be choſen than the uſe of them; and yet he doth not take notice of their being lookt on as neceſſary to Salvation: Therefore I conclude, againſt the Dr's Concluſion of this Second Part of his Book, that we are not obliged to prove againſt his Party, either Idolatry or falſe Worſhip, or making the *Ceremonies* neceſſary to Salvation. It is enough, if we prove, that ye make them neceſſary to our communicating with you, and that it is unlawful for us to uſe them; for hence it plainly followeth, that we muſt either live without the Ordinances, which were our Sin; or meet apart, for worſhipping God, which is our Duty, as your Impoſitions and Severities have ſtated us.

PART

PART III.

IN this Third Part of his Book, the Learned Author undertaketh to refute ſeveral Pleas that the Diſſenters uſe for their not communicating with the *Church of England*, and for keeping Meetings *ſeparate* from the *Church*. The Diſſenters, as they are of different perſwaſions, ſo they uſe different Pleas in defence of their ways. I ſhall not take the defence of them all; but before I come to examine this part of the Dr's Book, I ſhall give my opinion of the ſeveral Pleas that he refuteth, and fix upon what I ſhall own.

SECT. I.

The ſeveral Pleas uſed by Diſſenters, conſidered.

I Behold the Pleas uſed for the preſent *ſeparating* from the publick Aſſemblies, as divided into three ſorts. 1. Some that I do not think to be any juſt cauſe of complaint againſt the *Church of England*; 2. Some that are Grievances to us, that we dare not own nor approve, but deſire a *Reformation* of them; yet I do not think that they by themſelves make Communion with the publick Aſſemblies unlawful, nor can juſtifie *Separation*: 3. Some that not only are Grievances, but do juſtifie; yea, make neceſſary ſome ſort of *ſeparation*; and theſe I ſhall afterward further ſubdiſtinguiſh. Of the firſt ſort, I reckon the Conſtitution of the Church in its Members at firſt; want of governing Power in the People; and the Conſtitution of a *National Church*, as it is ſcrup'ed at by ſome.

Sect. 2. For the ſecond ſort, they are not a few, neither can I promiſe to name them all. 1. We are grieved with *Prelatical Government*, and taking away of that parity of Power that Chriſt hath given to the ordinary Miniſters of his Church. This we cannot approve, and therefore Miniſters ought rather to ſuffer deprivation of the publick Exerciſe of their Miniſtry, than own it. And peo-

ple

ple alſo ought not to own that their lordly Authority that they exerciſe; yet, becauſe this is not required to be acknowledged as a lawful Power in the Church, by the people, I ſee not that we ſhould withdraw from the publick Aſſemblies, meerly becauſe there are *Dioceſan Biſhops* ſet over the *Church*; except our owning them, by ſubmitting to their Juriſdiction, is required as one of the *Terms of Communion* with the *Church*. 2. Depriving people of their Right of chuſing their own *Church-Officers*, is alſo matter of complaint; but we muſt bear it, rather than *ſeparate* for that, from a *Church*. 3. The groſs Abuſes that are in the Diſcipline of the *Church*, or rather the want of any thing that looketh like Goſpel Diſcipline, we lament; but it not being peoples work to mend it, nor the Abuſes their perſonal action, it is no juſt ground of *Separation*. 4. *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* in Baptiſm are an abuſe; but being extrinſick to the Ordinance, we ſhould not *ſeparate* for that neither. 5. The defects and faults that are in the Call of the Miniſters, and in their perſonal Converſation, their Pluralities and Non-reſidences, and ſeveral things of that nature we complain of, and the inſufficiency of many of them, but do not *ſeparate* for theſe, while the Ordinances are not corrupted that we partake of. 6. The *Surplice*, and other *ſuperſtitious Habits*, worſhipping toward the *Eaſt*, bowing to the Altar, and ſuch-like, we dare not approve nor practiſe; yet theſe not being impoſed as *Terms of our Communion* with the *Church*, we do not *ſeparate* on account of them. The lawfulneſs of theſe I do not now debate; nor is it needful at all to do it, in reference to the point of *Separation*, that the Dr. chargeth us with; yet they being things wherein we diſſent from our Brethren, I ſhall not ſhun to diſpute ſuch of them with the Dr. as his following Diſcourſe ſhall give occaſion for.

Sect. 3. There are a third ſort of things that we diſlike in the *Epiſcopal Church of England*, which not only are matter of Grievance, but do neceſſitate us (and juſtifie us in it) to depart from her Communion till theſe Letts be removed; and they are of two ſorts: 1. The unlawful *Terms of Communion* with Her, that She requireth of us; without which ſhe will not ſuffer us to partake with Her in the Ordinances of God; as, that we muſt worſhip God by the *Liturgy*; that our Children, when baptized, muſt be ſigned with the *Croſs*; that we muſt *Kneel* in the Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; that we muſt obſerve the *Holidays* that She hath appointed, but Chriſt never inſtituted. Theſe things we think unlawful to be done;

done; and the *Church*, tho' She thinketh them indifferent and unneceſſary in themſelves, yet have made them neceſſary by Her impoſing them, and *excommunicateth* and perſecuteth us, if we will not uſe them; and therefore a parting from Her on theſe accounts, doth neceſſarily follow; not only becauſe we ought not to live without God's Ordinances, which we cannot have with our Brethren, but becauſe, if we would do ſo, they would ſtill perſecute us, if we come not to the *Liturgy*; if we have not our Children baptized; if we do not receive the Lord's Supper thrice a Year, and eſpecially at *Eaſter*; if we do not obſerve the *Holidays*. A ſecond thing that layeth a neceſſity on us, to have Meetings apart from them, is, their reſtraining of a conſiderable part of the Miniſters, whom Chriſt had ſent to his *Church*, and fitted by his Gifts for Goſpel-Adminiſtrations (upward of Two Thouſand of them being put out in one day.) We think it is the Duty of theſe men to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter the Ordinances of God, and the Duty of the People to wait on their Adminiſtrations, and to own their relation to them. It is true, this by it ſelf conſidered, need not hinder our Communion, and that ordinarily with the publick Aſſemblies, for things might be ſo managed, as no claſhing needed be; but this putteth us under a neceſſity of meeting by our ſelves, and the ſinful *Terms of Communion* impoſed, putteth us out of capacity to aſſemble with our Brethren in publick. Theſe I now but propoſe, but intend to diſpute them as they fall in, in the Doctor's Diſcourſe.

SECT. II.

Of Parochial Churches.

IN the beginning of this third Part, the Reverend Author reduceth the Pleas for *Separation*, to Four Heads, 1. *Such as relate to the conſtitution of our Church.* 2. *To the Terms of Communion with it.* 3. *To the Conſciences of Diſſenters.* 4. *To the parity of Reaſon, as to our Separation from* Rome: Under the Firſt he ranketh, 1. *That the Pariſh Churches are not of Chriſt's Inſtitution.* 2. *That Dioceſan Churches are unlawful.* 3. *That the National Church hath no Foundation.* 4. *That the People are deprived of their Rights in the choice of their Paſtors.* About theſe Four laſt mentioned, he ſpendeth the far greateſt part of

of this third part of his Book; and a very small part of it upon the Second Head; which is that which he knoweth his Antagonists do most generally insist on, and lay most weight on; but it is easiest going over the Hedge, where it is lowest.

Sect. 2. He beginneth with Parochial Churches, *because it is Separation from those, that is most Conspicuous.* He saith, *the Nonconformists at first kept Communion with them.* I have before disproved the Truth of this, and also given reasons, why the practice of them who did so, is not binding to us. He saith, *Since the Congregational way prevailed in* England, *the present Dissenters are generally fallen into it; at least so far as concerns Communion with our Parochial Churches. Ans.* There was a withdrawing from the Parochial Churches, because of unlawful *Terms of Communion*, before the present *Congregational way* was either known, or prevailed; and to say that Dissenters are generally fallen into the Congregational way (I suppose that he meaneth by it) is a mistake; it is true, indeed, the restraint (he will be angry if I say Persecution) that they are under, maketh *Presbyterian* Meetings *de facto* in many places *Independant*; because they cannot associate for Discipline; but we have not quitted our principles for that.

Sect. 3. I do not Interpose in his Contests with Dr. *O.* about the Parochial *Churches* in *England* being true Churches; or about Dr. *O*'s reasons for *separating* from them. But I cannot pass our Reverend Authors Ingenuity, in acknowledging p. 221. That *Tyranny over Mens Consciences is a good Ground of Separation*; which is our great Plea for withdrawing from their Assemblies: They impose on us *Terms of Communion*, that they can pretend to no other warrant for, but their own Fancy and Will; and they exclude us, because we cannot yield to them: If this be not *Tyranny over the Consciences of Men*, let any unbyassed Person judge; and if it be so judged to be, we have good Ground for *Separation* by the Dr's own confession.

Sect. 4. Our Author, *Sect.* 2. maintaineth a long debate with Dr. *O.* about this Question; whether one *Church* is that which ordinarily assembleth in one place; or divers assemblies, that meet ordinarily in divers places for worship, be to be reckoned divers *Churches.* This Question is stiffly debated on both sides, between the *Congregational* and *Episcopal* Brethren; the reason of their so much concern in it, is, the one ascribeth all *Church* Power to every Congregation that ordinarily meeteth for worship; and so

maketh that the higheſt ruling *Church*: The other placeth ruling *Church*-power only in the *Biſhop*; and ſo maketh a *Dioceſan Church*, to be the loweſt ruling *Church*. The *Presbyterians* go a middle way; they ſtand not on the λογομαχία, whether a Congregation ſhould be called a *Church*, or only the Combination of more Congregations, for the Exerciſe of Diſcipline; they find the word uſed both ways in Scripture (and the Word it ſelf, ἐκκλησία, ſignifieth any Convention, Civil or Religious) as, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. all the Chriſtians in *Corinth*, with their Officers, are called the *Church*; and yet 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. it is ſuppoſed that there were ſeveral Meetings among them ordinarily, that might bear each of them that name, of *Church*. When the Apoſtle forbiddeth, that their Women ſhould ſpeak in the *Churches*, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, he muſt mean the *Churches* in *Coriath*; for it is not to be thought, that he would particularly have mentioned their Women, αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν, if he had not meant the *Churches* of *Corinth*, where they were likeſt to uſurp that Authority. The Dr. ſaith, p. 235. That *it doth not once fail, that where Churches are ſpoken of in the Plural Number, they are the Churches of a Province*: Here it faileth.

Sect. 5. But leaving the Word, let us underſtand the thing; which I ſhall ſet down in a few Aſſertions. 1. All viſible Chriſtians are Members of one Great Body; whereof Chriſt is the head; to wit, his *Univerſal Church*; which if it could ſo meet together as to be taught, and ruled, ordinarily, by the ſame Officers, there needed be no diſtinction of *Churches* in the World. And it is probable it was ſo in the beginning of the Goſpel; till the encreaſe of Believers made it needful to divide into ſeveral Companies, that might be ordinarily taught and ruled by their ſeveral Officers. 2. The ſeveral Companies of Believers, with their ſeveral Officers (each of which in Scripture-ſence, may be called a *Church*) are to be ſuch as may commonly meet together in one place, for partaking of God's Ordinances. We read of the Apoſtles ordaining Elders in every City, κατὰ πόλιν: ſure then they had reſpect to the conveniences of Peoples living together, that ſo they might uſually meet together. 3. Theſe ſingle Congregations being furniſhed with one or more Paſtors, and Elders have ruling Power within themſelves; for Chriſt hath given ruling power to all the Paſtors and Elders, and not placed it ſingle in a *Dioceſan Biſhop*; for at *Philippi*, *Phil.* 2. 1. all *Church-Officers* are divided into *Biſhops* and *Deacons*; a plurality of which were in that *Church*, tho' in one City;

ty; where our Brethren acknowledge, that more *Dioceſans* than one could not be. 4. The *Church* power in ſingle Congregations, is not *Independant*, but is to be ſubordinate to the power of them, aſſociate together. This may be gathered from the *Churches* in *Corinth*, being there alſo called a *Church*: If there were not divers religious Aſſemblies, ordinarily they could not be called *Churches*; if they were not Aſſociate, they could not be called a *Church*; and wherein they could be Aſſociate, except in the Exerciſe of Government, is not eaſy to gueſs. 5. The Aſſociation of *Churches* for Government may be divers, as their Convenience of meeting together for that end, giveth them opportunity: Hence particular Aſſemblies, leſſer and greater Aſſociations, have their *Congregational*, *Claſſical*, *Provincial*, and *National Presbyteries*, or *Aſſemblies*, for the Government of the *Church*; the Leſſer in Subordination to the Greater And if Oecumenical Synods could as conveniently, and duly aſſemble, all the reſt ſhould be ſubordinate to them, ſeeing every one of them ſhould make a part of theſe.

Sect. 6. But becauſe the diverſity of Civil Powers, and frequent claſhings of them, in divers Nations maketh this hardly practicable; therefore the higheſt *Church-power* is uſually in *National Aſſemblies*. And tho' I am far from the opinion of them, who think that Church *Government* ſhould be modelled according to the civil government of the Nation; the contrary of which I have aſſerted elſewhere againſt the Learned Author (whom I now diſpute with) yet in this particular, it not only may, but muſt be ſuited to the extent of the Civil Government: This being no eſſential part of *Church-Government*, nor inſtituted; but a Circumſtance of it, determinable by neceſſity and conveniency. On the ſame Score, where a Congregation could have no other to Aſſociate with, it might act Independantly, and be blameleſs. 6. Tho' Chriſtians ſhould ſo divide themſelves into particular *Churches*, as they may attend the Ordinances together ordinarily; yet is not this meeting together, but their being under the particular Inſpection of the ſame Officers, that maketh one particular *Church*: For, 1. One Congregation may encreaſe to that number, that one place cannot contain them; and yet continue one Congregation, till they be regularly divided: Thus it was in ſome of the Ancient *Churches*. 2. Where Parochial Bounds are ſo large, as all the People cannot always travel to one place; the Paſtor or Paſtors of the *Church*, may well have places more convenient for ſome of them, where he or they may Admini-

ſter the Ordinances to them, ſometimes; as in *Chapels of Eaſe*; and yet they all continue one particular *Church*. 3. It is a frequent caſe with Families, that but a part of them at one time, can leave the Houſe, to wait on publick Ordinances; and the reſt at another time; yet are they one Congregation. 4. In a time of Perſecution, where the Flock is but ſmall, and might eaſily be contained in one Houſe, the Danger of numerous Meetings may be ſuch, as it may be needful, that but a part of them ſhould come together at once, and that by turns; as we are neceſſitated at this time to do: This doth not make divers Congregations. All this conſidered we are little concerned; whether in the Primitive Times there were but one *Church* in a City, or more? Whether thoſe called *Churches* did meet in one place, or not; as long as the one Party cannot prove, that each Meeting was ruled Independantly by it ſelf; nor the other, that a *Diocesan Biſhop* ruled over more *Churches* than one, and over their *Presbyters*.

Sect. 7. Before I part with this diſcourſe of the Dr's about the Unity of *Churches*, I take notice of his confident Aſſerting, p. 226. the impoſſibility of the change of *Church-Government*, ſo ſuddenly from its firſt inſtitution; even though the *Church* fell into *Hereſies* very ſoon, yet this change could not be. The ſame thing he had aſſerted before, and I have anſwered it, *Præf. Sect.* 9. His further conſiderations to enforce what he had ſaid, are not weighty; to wit, That *Government is ſo nice and tender a Point, that they out of whoſe Hands it was taken by thoſe who uſurped it, would certainly have complained.* This he enlarge upon: But I anſwer, 1. It may be they did; that they did not, is not proved by the ſilence of Hiſtory: A Negative Argument here is not concludent; eſpecially conſidering the Lameneſs of the Hiſtory of the firſt Centuries; and what we have of it, is by thoſe who had a Hand in the Uſurpation. 2. He doth not conſider, that Men might Sleep, while others were robbing them; as Chriſt foretold, *Matth.* 13. 25. 3. We may rationally think that Government in the *Church* (which then was no Lordly Dominion, but a painful Miniſtery, or Service; and made unpleaſant by the croſs Humors of them that needed it moſt) was not then ſo *nice and tender a Point*, to honeſt and well-meaning *Presbyters*, as it is now to our aſpiring *Church-men*; they were Men of another ſtamp; they were willing to lie by, if the work were done; and they might think, that others might do it better than they (this is not to juſtifie them, but to take off mens wonder at this)

this) and Men of higher parts and Spirits might eaſily, by degrees, wreſt Power out of the Hands of as good men as themſelves, who were not ſo fore-ſeeing as they ſhould have been; nor ſo tinctured with Ambition as they; though other ways good, and eminent Men. And we need the leſs wonder at this, when we conſider, that this thing was not done ſuddenly; but by inſenſible ſteps, in the ſpace of three or four Hundred Years. *Cyprian* (whom the Dr. layeth moſt weight on in this matter) lived in the third Century, & even then we deny that *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* was ſetled. What the Dr. ſaith under this Head of the Plurality of Congregations in the ſeveral Cities, that ſeemeth to prove Epiſcopal Power over *Presbyters*, ſhall be anſwered σὺν Θεῷ, in the next Section; where it is more proper: Alſo what he here ſaith againſt popular Election, is to be conſidered in its place; becauſe I would not confound Subjects ſo divers.

SECT. III.

Whether Dioceſan *Epiſcopacy be lawful.*

THE ſecond Plea for *Separation*, that the Learned Dr. conſidereth, is, *the Unlawfulneſs of Dioceſan Epiſcopacy*; which he taketh a great deal of pains to prove to be, 1. Primitive; 2. Not repugnant to any Inſtitution of Chriſt; 3. That its Diſcipline, as exerciſed in *England*, doth not overthrow the Being of Parochial Churches. All this he manageth, *Sect.* 8, *&c.* I might ſhun this whole Debate, having above diſowned this as a Plea for *Separation*, except in ſo far as we are required to own it. But becauſe we look on this *Epiſcopacy*, as unlawful to be uſed or owned, I ſhall examine what the Dr. ſaith in defence of it: This is done already to much more advantage than can be expected from me by the learned Author of, *No Evidence for Dioceſan Churches or Biſhops, &c.* and the defence of that Piece, under the Title of, *Dioceſan Churches not yet diſcovered in the Primitive Times*; which might ſuperſede all that I have to ſay, and ſhall make me ſay the leſs, referring the Reader to theſe two moſt Learned Books; yet, leſt there ſhould be an *hiatus* in this Diſcourſe, I ſhall not wholly decline this debate with the Doctor.

Sect. 2. Mr. *B*'s Frame of Church-Government, (which the Dr.

Dr. disproveth, p. 242, 243.) being singular, himself can best defend it; wherefore I leave it, and shall attend the Dr's proof of the three particulars above mentioned, first asserting a few things that may clear our way. 1. That it is not the Name of *Bishop* that we quarrel, it being applied in Scripture to all the ordinary ruling Officers in the *Church*, as distinguished from her Servants, the *Deacons*, *Phil.* 1, 1. and the Exercise of it called a good Work, 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. and applied to all the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Act.* 20. 28. 2. We meddle not with their Titles and Revenues; those are the Magistrates Gifts, and do not cross Christ's Institution, whatever inconvenience may be in them. 3. Nor do we deny the Lawfulness of a *Presidency* among Presbyters in the Person of one of them. Nature maketh it necessary, that one should preside in a Meeting to shun Confusion; and Christ hath not instituted the duration of one man's *Presidency*, whether for one meeting, for a Month, or Year, or during his life, and therefore the *Church* may determine in that: Yet we must add, That the perpetuating of a προέδρου, or making a *moderator constant*, having been, of old and late, the means of bringing in a *Lordly Prelacy*, and corruption of ambitious men being so apt to improve it that way; so that the *Papal* Chair hath arisen from this low and blameless Foundation, we think it highly inconvenient. 4. Neither do we deny, that among Ministers, the wiser, graver, and men of more Holiness and Experience, should by their reason prevail over those that are not so well qualified: It is Superiority of Power that is in question between us and our Brethren; yea, we deny not, but some of Opinion for parity of Power, have overborn their Brethren, through their loftiness of Spirit; an *Episcopal Temper* may be in a *Presbyterian*; it is not mens Corruptions, but their Principles that our debate is about. 5. We deny not, but the Name, *Bishop*, that in the Apostles times was common to all Elders of the *Church*, began very early to be appropriated to the Moderator, who also was called *Primus Presbyter*: and that this priority, for as small as it was, was too much affected and taken notice of, even in the Apostles times. *Diotrephes* (who is said, φιλοπρωτεύειν, *Jo.* 3. 9. *i. e.* affected to be *Primus Presbyter*) had a great mind to that dignity; but this was, when few of the Apostles were now alive. It is neither the *Presidency* nor the *Precedency* that we debate about, but the Imparity of Church-Power or Authority. 6. We deny not that prelatical Usurpation obtained in some places, and was snatched at in other places; while yet the ancient Order of

Parity

Parity, among the Paſtors of the *Church*, was in moſt places retained. 7. Though we deny, that *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* prevailed in the *Church*, for the firſt Three Hundred Years, or that it was general in the fourth Century, and are willing to enter the Liſts with our Brethren in this debate about the firſt and pureſt Antiquity of *Church-Government*; yet it is not mens Authority, but divine Inſtitution, that we are determined by, and lay the ſtreſs of our Cauſe upon; and will admit of no abſolute Rule of judging in this Controverſie, but the Scripture.

Sect. 3. It might have been expected, that the Dr. when he would charge us with ſo great blame, as he doth, in not ſubmitting to the Authority of *Prelates*, ſhould have proved the Divine Inſtitution, or at leaſt, the lawfulneſs of that Office, and anſwered the Arguments that our Writers bring againſt it. This were the way to ſatisfie Mens Conſciences; but the Dr. is pleaſed to take an eaſier, though not ſo perſwaſive a way, to wit, to refute Mr. *B*'s. Aſſertions about *Epiſcopacy*, and to prove ſome things that are ſhort of the main thing that is in queſtion; as I hope ſhall appear in our Progreſs. And I have often obſerved, that the confidence of our Brethrens Aſſertions in this Controverſie is too big for the ſtrength and concludency of their Arguments.

Sect. 4. It will contribute to our clear, and ſure procedure in this Controverſie, if we conſider the difference and inconſiſtency that is among our *Prelatical* Brethren about the *Epiſcopacy* that they aſſert; and the Foundation on which they build it, as to the thing; ſome of them do ſo reſtrain the Power of *Biſhops*, denying both ſole Ordination and ſole Juriſdiction to them, that they make it little or no more, but a *Preſidency*: So the learned and Pious *Uſher*, who is followed by many of the more ſober and learned of that party. *Grotius* alſo goeth this way, *de Imper. ſum. poteſt. circa ſacra*, p. 337. others allow them *Juriſdiction* over other Paſtors of the *Church*, and exempt them from being liable to the Cenſures of their Brethren; yet ſo as they ought not to rule by themſelves, but with the conſent of the Paſtors of the *Church*, who are to be their Counſel. Our Author, *Iren.* p. 309. ſaith, that *both* Jerom, *and* Ignatius *agree, that the Counſel of Presbyters was of Divine Inſtitution.* Others are for their *Monarchial* power in their ſeveral Dioceſſes; neither being obliged to take the Counſel of the *Presbyters*; nor being liable to their cenſures: So the generality of our *High Church-men*. Some make the *Biſhop* the ſole Paſtor of the Dioceſs; and all the Parochial

chial Clergy to be but his *Curates*; others think the Parochial Paſtors to be ſubſtitute, or delegate to none but Chriſt; ſome think the *Biſhop*'s work is to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter Sacraments in his own Perſon, and that this, he ſhould be conſtantly exerciſed in: Others, that his Work is to rule, and that he need not trouble himſelf with other Work, unleſs he pleaſe. Some allow the *Biſhop* a Power of delegating his Authority; not of diſpenſing the Word and Sacraments only, but of *Government* and *Diſcipline*, to others; yea, to Lay-men; that by them he may *Excommunicate*, and judge Miniſters and People: Others think that he hath no power to do ſo; ſo methink that it is inconſiſtent with the Office of a *Biſhop* to be imployed in Civil Government, others allow it. Some think a *Biſhop* ſhould be choſen by the *Church*, and that really, and not ſeemingly only, as when the Magiſtrate nominateth the Perſon to the Chapter (who yet are not the *Church*) of whom they muſt proceed to a Mock election; others think thoſe that come in this way, to be none of Chriſts *Biſhops*. Some own *Dioceſan Biſhops*, who yet ſee no warrant for the *Hierarchy*, as it is ſtated among us, in *Metropolitans*, *Primates*, *Arch-biſhops*, *Deans*, *Arch-deacons*, *Chancellors*, &c. Some hold the Office of *Biſhop* to be diſtinct from that of *Presbyter*; others deny this; many School men are on both ſides; it was debated at the Council of *Trent*. In all theſe things, I obſerve very much Confuſion, and want of a diſtinct Idea of that Office, that is debated about in the Writings of our *Prelatical* Brethren.

Sect. 5. There is as little agreement, or diſtinctneſs among them about the Foundation, on which the Office of a *Dioceſan Biſhop* ſtandeth: Some of them are for its *divine Right*, as being inſtituted by Chriſt: But this Plea they find ſo hard to be managed, and to have ſo ill ſucceſs, and to be ſo little the way to preferment, (as derogating from the *Supremacy* of the Magiſtrate) that moſt have laid it aſide; others, that it is of *Apoſtolick inſtitution*; being not commanded by Chriſt, but prudently ſetled by the *Apoſtles*. Others, that it is *juris eccleſiaſtici* brought in by the *Primitive Church*, after the deceaſe of all the Apoſtles. Others, that it is wholly indifferent, and may be received, or not, as is thought moſt expedient in ſeveral times and places; and ſome of theſe ſay, this is to be determined by the *Church*: Others, by the *Magiſtrate*. This Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his *Irenicum* aſſerteth; but is very uncertain, whether the *Church* or *Magiſtrate* is to determine in this matter. One of the moſt Learned of our Adverſaries, Dr. *Hammond*, holdeth

holdeth the Divine Right of *Epiſcopacy*, but goeth away different from all the reſt in managing of that Opinion; to wit, that all the ordinary Paſtors of the *Church*, appointed by Chriſt, or ordained by the Apoſtles, were *Dioceſan Biſhops*, and that *Presbyters* are a ſort of Men unheard of in the New Teſtament, and their Office but a device of Men, or a conſtitution of the *Church*. This fancy is ſolidly refuted by learned Mr. *Durham*, on *Rev.* 3. p. 230. Where the Reader may ſee abundant ground of Satisfaction about the abſurdity and inconſiſtency of this Notion, from Scripture, Reaſon, and Antiquity.

Sect. 6. The queſtion between us and our brethren, being about the lawfulneſs of the prelacy now exerciſed in *England*, the owning of which is required of us; that we may judge aright of it, we muſt have a true Idea of it, and then conſider whether ſuch an *Epiſcopacy* was inſtituted by Chriſt, practiſed in the primitive Church with general approbation; or whether it hath any rational Foundation to ſtand upon. The true Idea of our *Engliſh Epiſcopacy* is viſible in theſe Lineaments of it; Firſt, The *Biſhop* is one of a Superior Order to, and diſtinct Office from, other *Presbyters*, as appeareth not only from the power he hath, and they have not, and acts of *Church*-power reſerved only to him; but alſo becauſe he is put into that Office by an ordination diſtinct from that by which he is made a *Presbyter*. And yet further, becauſe the *Presbyters* are owned but as his Delegates, or Curates, and he is owned as the ſole Paſtor of all the *Presbyters*, People and Flocks in the Dioceſs. Secondly, The *Biſhops* have jurisdiction over other *Presbyters*. Thirdly, He hath the ſole Power of Ordination of *Presbyters*. Fourthly, He may delegate this Power to whom he will, whether Men Ordained to the Miniſtry, or any of the people; ſo that by this Delegation, a Man that is no *Church-Officer* may exerciſe *Church-Power* over both Miniſters and People. Fifthly, This power is exerciſed in the name of the Magiſtrate, the Courts in which it is exerciſed being owned as the *Kings Eccleſiaſtical Court*. Sixthly, They are not choſen to this Office by the *Church*, but by the *Magiſtrate*, and they are not Preaching but Ruling Biſhops. Now if our Brethren cannot ſhew us ſuch a *Biſhop* as this in Scripture, or Antiquity, all that they ſay from either for an *Epiſcopacy*, is ſhort of the thing in queſtion, and our ſcruple cannot be taken away by their proofs for *Epiſcopacy*, unleſs they prove this *Epiſcopacy*.

Sect. 7. Though our Writers have brought Arguments againſt the lawfulneſs of this Office in the *Church* that have never yet been anſwered, and I think never ſhall; and tho' I can promiſe no new nor better Arguments than have been already adduced by others; yet that the Reader may ſee that our Scruples againſt *Epiſcopacy* are not without good ground, I ſhall briefly ſet down ſome Arguments againſt it. The firſt ſhall be, *ad hominem*, againſt our learned Author: By this Author's Doctrine, there is no ground to believe that ſuch an *Epiſcopacy* as conſiſteth in a Superiority of Power above Presbyters, was Inſtituted, Allowed, or Exerciſed in the *Church*; *Ergo*, according to him, it hath no Foundation at all that can ſatisfie ones Conſcience about the lawfulneſs of it. The *Antitheſis* I prove, If ſuch a ground there be, it muſt lie in one of theſe three (if any aſſerters of it can add a fourth, we ſhall quit this Argument) either Chriſts appointing it in Scripture, or his allowing Men to appoint ſuch an Office, or the practice of the *Church*, ſhewing us what was Chriſts allowance. But none of theſe yield us a Warrant for *Epiſcopacy*, all the three being denyed by this Author to be able to ſatisfie the Conſcience in this matter. For the firſt, he denyeth ſuch an Inſtitution, aſſerting expreſly that Chriſt gave equal power to all the Ordinary Miniſters of the Goſpel; this is the baſis of his *Irenicum*. The ſecond, he never had the confidence to aſſert, neither is the leaſt hint in all the Scripture, that Chriſt hath allowed Men to take away that power from his Servants that He hath given them, and to put it into the hand of others to whom He never gave ſuch eminency of power. For the third, he proveth at length that the primitive form of *Church-Government* is uncertain, from the Defectiveneſs, Ambiguity, Partiality, and Repugnancy of the Records of the Ages that ſucceeded the Apoſtles times, *Irem.* c. 6. p. 294. Let him tell us then what ground we have to belive that *Epiſcopacy* was Inſtituted by Chriſt, practiſed by the *Church* in Her uncorrupted times, or any way allowed.

Sect. 8. Our ſecond Argument is, There is no foot-ſtep of any inequality of power among theſe Ordinary Paſtors of the *Church*, that are mentioned in the Bible, neither in their Name, nor Office, nor Power, nor Work, nor Qualifications, nor Reſpect or Obedience due to them, nor any thing elſe from which any diſtinction can be rationally gathered; whence I thus Argue: If the Lord had allowed a diſtinction between *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* in his

his *Church*, he would have hinted ſome thing about this diſtinction; but this he hath not done, *Ergo*, *&c.* The firſt propoſition I prove, firſt, Becauſe this was needful for theſe diſtinct Officers, that each might know his work: And for the *Church-Guides* that they might know how to chuſe and ordain qualified Men for ſo different Imployments: And for the people that they might know how to carry toward theſe Officers reſpect according to the difference of their Stations, that they might obey the *Biſhop* rather than the *Presbyter*,--- and ſubmit to the Teaching of the *Presbyter* and ruling of the *Biſhop*; that they might not come to a *Presbyter* for *Confirmation*, nor call *Presbyters* to ordain a Miniſter for them, nor delegate a perſon that deſerveth *Excommunication* to the *Presbyters*, all theſe belonging to the *Biſhop*. 2. Our Lord hath made a clear diſtinction in Scripture, among the other Ordinary Officers in the *Church*, in their Names, Qualifications, Work, and Office, as between *Elders* or *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, *Phil.* 1. 1. 1 *Tim.* 3. 2, 9. Alſo between *Preaching Elders*, and thoſe that are only *Ruling Elders*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. If our Brethren can ſhew us as much for a diſtinction between *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, let them do it: I hope none of them will ſay, that by *Ruleing Elders* is here meant the *Biſhop*, leaſt it follow that the Preaching *Presbyter* ſhould rather be honoured than he, either by affording him more reſpect or maintenance: I ſuppoſe our *Biſhops* will rather part with the Patrimony of this Text, then with their Titles, Grandeur, and Revenues.

Sect. 9. The ſecond Propoſition is evident in the ſeveral Branches mentioned before, for our Adverſaries can produce no hint of any ſuch diſtinction in Scripture, and we can ſhew an identity in them; And firſt, for the name it is clear from *Act.* 20. 28. where the Apoſtle calleth all the Elders of *Epheſus*, *Biſhops*. It is a groundleſs fancy of ſome, that theſe *Elders* were the *Dioceſan Biſhops* of *Aſia*; for this is ſaid without any ſhew of proof, to ſerve a turn. Beſides that, they are called the *Elders* of the *Church*, not *Churches*, as (even in the prelatical Stile) Dioceſan diſtricts ſhould be called. And it is called the *Flock*, not *Flocks*, and the *Church of God*, not the *Churches of God*, that they were to take heed to; and the haſte that the Apoſtle then was in, conſidering the ſhort time, and long journey that he had before him, was inconſiſtent with his expecting ſuch an Aſſembly from ſo remote parts. This identity of name is alſo clear from *Phil.* 1. 1. for no reaſon can be aſſigned

why *Deacons* ſhould be mentioned, as concerned in what was written in that Epiſtle and not *Presbyters*. Alſo it is moſt clear, *Tit.* 1. 5. with 7. where ſhewing how *Elders* muſt be qualified, a reaſon is given why they muſt have ſuch Qualifications, *for a Biſhop muſt be Blameleſs*; if they were not one, this reaſon ſhould have neither force nor ſence, which were Blaſphemy to averr, it being the Holy Ghoſts reaſoning.

Sect. 10. In the next place, Scripture maketh no diſtinction between the Office of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, many of our brethren deny a diſtinction of Office betwixt them (how conſiſtently with their other principles I enquire not) and they that aſſert ſuch a diſtinction cannot ſhew the leaſt foot-ſtep of it from Scripture. Thirdly, for their power, if *Biſhops* ordained, ſo did *Presbyters*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. If any alledge that the ordainers of *Timothy* were *Dioceſan Biſhops*, they muſt prove it: If *Biſhops had rule over the people, were over them*, ſo were *Presbyters*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 13. 17. For none queſtion but *Presbyters* are they who mainly labour among the people, admoniſh them, and watch for their Souls, (I am ſure this is not the work that our *Biſhops* are exerciſed in) and the ſame perſons in both places are the peoples Rulers, and are over them. Fourthly, Their Work is the ſame, as is clear both from the places laſt cited, and *Act.* 20. 28. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2. Where taking heed to, feeding, and over-ſeeing, in the Greek, acting the part of *Biſhops*, ἐπισκοπέντε, are made the work of all the Paſtors of the *Church*. 5. The ſame qualifications are required in all the guides of the *Church* without any diſtinction, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *Tit.* 1. 5. And the qualification of *Deacons*, they being a diſtinct ſort of Officers in the *Church*, are ſet down by themſelves, 1 *Tim.* 3. 8. Sixthly, for Obedience, Reverence, Maintenance, or any thing elſe, that concerneth a *Biſhop* as diſtinct from a *Presbyter*, there is not the leaſt hint in Scripture from which any ſuch thing can be gathered; a Man muſt then put force upon his reaſon, or be ſtrangely ſwayed by prejudice, who can perſwade himſelf that there is an ordinary Officer mentioned or allowed in the New Teſtament, that is above the *Presbyters* of the Church, or hath juriſdiction over them.

Sect. 11. Argument third. The Apoſtle doth thrice ſet down a liſt of the ſeveral Officers of the *Goſpel-Church*, without mentioning a *Dioceſan Biſhop*, or any Officer to which this Office can be rationally reduced; *Ergo*, no ſuch Officer ought to be allowed in the

the *Church*. The conſequence I prove, firſt, Becauſe this ſhould have been a defect not imputable to the Apoſtle, infallibly guided by the Spirit, to teach us deſignedly the ſeveral *Church-Officers* appointed by Chriſt, and not tell us of them all: Let our brethren, if they can, give us an inſtance of a defectiveneſs in any Scripture-inſtruction of this moment that can be parallelled with this. Secondly, The conſequence can yet leſs be queſtioned, if we conſider that not only an Officer is left out, and the *Church* left without a hint concerning him; but the chief ordinary Officer in the *Church*, that ſhould make the greateſt Figure in the *Church* to the end of the World, and on whoſe management the weightieſt affairs of the *Church* ſhould depend: He who can believe this, his Judgment muſt be under the power of ſo ſtrong a Byaſs, that I know not what will be too hard for him to Swallow; the *Antitheſis* I prove out of 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11. *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. Not any of theſe Offices agreeth to the *Dioceſan Biſhop*; ſome ſay, they are reducible to Apoſtles. With what face can wiſe men alledge this? Was not the Office of an Apoſtle extraordinary, and temporary, appointed for the firſt diſperſing the Goſpel, and planting *Churches*; and beſides every Apoſtle was an Univerſal Officer: Dioceſans have their limitted charges: Some alledge they are reducible to Apoſtles, not as being abſolutely ſuch, but becauſe they have power over inferior Miniſters as the Apoſtles had. But theſe men ſhould prove that Chriſt inſtituted ſuch an Office, or that the Apoſtle meant not only extraordinary Apoſtles, but theſe *Semi-Apoſtles* as ordinary Officers to continue in the Church. Secondly, They ſhould prove that Chriſts inſtituting Apoſtles, did warrant the Church to ſet up an Office made up of as much of the Apoſtles Office, as ſhould be afterward thought convenient. What may not men deviſe in the *Church*, that take on them thus to add to, or diminiſh from Chriſts Inſtitutions, and thus to wreſt Scripture to make it comply with their fancies and intereſts?

Sect. 12. Others make the *Doctors* or *Teachers*, *Eph.* 4. 11. to be the *Biſhops*, and this with as little ground as the former, though ſome learned Men have ſo dreamed, as *Eſtius*, and *Doctor Hammon*. *Grotius* thinks *Metropolitans* alſo are here meant, but the abſurdity of this fancy will appear, Firſt, If we conſider that they are named after the *Paſtors* or *Presbyters*, which is an indecency unſuitable to the Apoſtles Exactneſs, if my *Lord Biſhop* were here meant. I find many Interpreters argue that *Prophets* are the next in

in Dignity to *Apoſtles*, and are extraordinary Officers, becauſe they are named alwaies next after the Apoſtles, which Argument will as well hold here. Secondly, The work of the *Biſhop* that we ſpeak of, which diſcriminateth him from the *Presbyter*, is not to Teach but to Rule: Therefore others, as *Calvin*, by *Teacher* underſtandeth him that educateth Miniſters, and inſtructeth them and others in the truth, and defendeth it againſt Hereſies; ſuch as are *Divinity Profeſſors* in Univerſities; others underſtand *Catechiſts*: But it is evident that it cannot, with any kind of Congruity be applied to the *Dioceſan Biſhop*, who is leaſt imployed in Teaching of any part of *Church-Work*; ſome find the *Dioceſan Biſhop* under the name of *Helps*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. As *Grotius* and *Hammond*; both of them alſo make him to be meant by *Government*; and the ſame two Authors, in the ſame verſe by *Teachers* underſtand the ſame Officer. They would be ſure to find him ſomewhere, but this very uncertainty where to fix him is a token that he is no where to be found. Is it imaginable that the Apoſtle in a liſt of *Church-Officers* ſet down in ſo few words, would uſe ſuch repetition? When ſo Learned Men are put to ſuch ſhifts, it is a ſign the cauſe is ſo weak, that it affordeth no better reaſon to defend it by. That they are not meant by *Teachers*, I have already ſhewed; neither are they meant by *Helps*. Ἀντιλαμβάνομαι ſaith *Grotius*, *ſignificat, curam rei alicujus gerere*: This is ſaid without Book (be it ſpoken with due reſpect to that great Critick.) I find Authors cited for its ſignifying, to take hold, undertake, uphold, help, correct; but none for its ſignifying, to take charge of a thing. The place he referreth to, *Luk.* 1. 54. can bear no ſignification of the word ſo well as that of helping; and among all Criticks and other Interpreters, he cannot produce one that ſo expoundeth the word, either here or in that place: but Men will ſay any thing to ſerve a turn. Neither can the *Dioceſan* be meant by *Government*, not only becauſe they are among the laſt, and ſo the moſt inferior of *Church-Officers*; but alſo becauſe our Brethren will not ſay that the *Biſhop* ſhould only Rule, and not Teach (though it is too much their practice, yet they will not averr this to be according to Inſtitution) as this Officer muſt do, he being a diſtinct Officer from the *Teacher*. I conclude, If the Apoſtle had intended to ſet forth to us ſuch an Eminent Officer of the *Church*, we might have expected he ſhould have, if not clearly, yet to the Satisfaction of an inquiſitive mind, ſet him down in ſome of theſe Catalogues, which is not done.

Sect. 13.

Sect. 13. Argument fourth. The power that we read of in the New Teſtament, was never exerciſed by any ordinary Officers alone, but by the *Church-Guides* in *Common*; *Ergo*, there was no *Dioceſan Biſhop* in the New Teſtament, and if we have no warrant there, our ſcrupling to own ſuch a one is not unreaſonable. That *Church-Power* was ſo exerciſed I prove by Inſtances, leaving to our Brethren, if they can, to bring Inſtances to the contrary. Firſt, Ordination was performed by *Presbyters* in *Common*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. It is a groundleſs Notion that ſome Men of great Name and Worth have on this place, that *Presbytery* is meant of the Office, for both it is a harſh phraſe, the hands of the Office; and further the word πρεσβυτέριον is often uſed in the New Teſtament, yet is never uſed for the Office, but for the College of *Presbyters*; the Office is called πρεσβυτερεῖον ſaith *Camerarius*; others ſay, That by the *Presbytery* here is meant the Company of the Apoſtles, who are called *Presbyters*: This cannot be, for the Apoſtle aſcribeth to himſelf a ſpecial concern above others in the Ordination of *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Which he would not have done if the reſt of the Apoſtles, equal in Authority with himſelf, had concurred, but might well do it, when, he as chief, and the ordinary Paſtors as ſubordinate, did join in this Action, for (it is the obſervation of *Camerarius* on this Text) the Apoſtles did not uſe their extraordinary power often, but when the *Church* was conſtituted, acted in Conjunction with the ordinary Paſtors; and there was good reaſon for this, to wit, both that the *Church-Guides* might know that Apoſtolick power was not always to continue among them, and that they might learn the way of *Church-Adminiſtrations*, which they behoved to exerciſe by themſelves when the Apoſtles were gone.

Sect. 14. Another Inſtance is in *Excommunication*, which the Apoſtle injoineth the ordinary *Elders* of the *Church* of *Corinth* to exerciſe againſt the inceſtuous Man; he directeth his Injunctions not to a ſingle *Biſhop*, but to a Company of Men, 1 *Cor.* 5. That *they being gathered together ſhould deliver him to Satan*, verſ. 4, 5. That *they ſhould purge out that old leaven*, verſ. 7. That it was their part (not a ſingle perſons part) to *Judge the Members of the Church*, verſ. 12. That *they ſhould put away the wicked perſon*, verſ. 13. and ſpeaking of this Sentence, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. He expreſly ſaith it was done by many, and aſcribeth the power of forgiving (i. e. abſolving from the ſentence of *Excommunication*) to them, not to one

one Man. What ever different thoughts men may have about this *delivering to Satan*, or about the Apoſtles Intereſt in this Action, it is evident that here is *Church-Power* adjudging (which implyeth Authority) exerciſed by a Community. A Third, Inſtance of this is, 2 *Theſ.* 3. 14. Where a Community not a ſingle perſon is commanded *to Note them that were Diſobedient* to *Paul*'s Admonition in his Epiſtle. This is not to be underſtood as ſome take it, of *Noteing* the Diſobedient Perſon in an *Epiſtle*, that they ſhould write to *Paul*; For Firſt, The emphatick particle τῆς put before ἐπιστολῆς denoteth that *Epiſtle*, to wit, that the Apoſtle now wrote not an Epiſtle that they ſhould write. Secondly, The Greek word will not bear that ſignification σημειοῦσθε here uſed, is *Note*, or ſet a mark on him; to *Signifie*, or give *Notice*, is σημαίνω which word had ſurely been uſed if the Apoſtle had intended that they ſhould give Notice to him by an Epiſtle of the Diſobedient. Thirdly, He telleth them what ſhould follow on this *Note* ſet on the Man, and how they ſhould carry towards him when thus *Noted*; to wit, that *they ſhould have no company with him*; this would not follow on their Writing about him to the Apoſtle, while no Sentence was as yet paſſed againſt him, but might rationally follow upon their ſetting the ignominious mark of *Excommunication* upon him. If then *Church-Diſcipline*, in the Apoſtolick and beſt times of the *Church*, and eſpecially while the Apoſtles being yet alive, might have exerciſed it by themſelves or their Delegates, the *Evangeliſts*, was yet exerciſed uſually in Common, and not by a ſingle *Biſhop*; we have cauſe to ſcruple the owning of ſuch an Officer in the *Church*.

Sect. 15. Other Arguments from Scripture may be brought, but I ſhall not now inſiſt on them, having maintained ſome of them againſt this learned Author, in my *Animadverſions on his Irenicum*. Wherefore I ſhall only add a fifth Argument, as a ground of our ſcruple from ſome Teſtimonies of the Judgment and Practice of the *Primitive Church*, that ſucceeded to the Apoſtles. This may the more heighten our ſcruple, that our brethren lay the ſtreſs of their cauſe on the *Ancient Church*; if we cannot find there ſufficient ground for a *Dioceſan Biſhop*, but much to the contrary, they ought not to blame us if we cannot with them own ſuch an Office in the *Church*. The firſt Teſtimony that I bring, is that of *Jerome*, who giveth his Judgment of this matter, not *Obiter*, but of ſet purpoſe, as that which was his ſetled Opinion, and that oftner than once.

In

In his *Epiſtle* to *Enagrius*, where he ſharply reproveth ſome as Impudent, that preferred *Deacons* to *Presbyters*, i. e. ſaith he, to *Biſhops*, but ſheweth at length that *Biſhops* and *Prebyters* are the ſame, for which he citeth, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Act.* 20. 28. *Tit.* 1. 5, 6, 7. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2. and if any ſhould think little of theſe Teſtimonies he addeth; *clanget tuba Evangelij, filius tonitru, &c.* and ſo citeth, 2 *Joh. ver.* 1. and 3. *Joh. v.* 1. and after he hath ſhewed the occaſion of preferring one *Presbyter* to the reſt, he telleth, that notwithſtanding of their Riches or Poverty, Greatneſs or Meanneſs; the difference of Cities where they are, *ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubij, ſive Conſtantinopoli, &c.* they are *ejuſdem meriti & Sacerdotij*; and ſheweth that the Apoſtle giving direction to *Timothy* and *Titus*, about Ordination of *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, ſaith nothing of *Presbyters*; becauſe the *Presbyter* is contained in the *Biſhop*; that is, they are the ſame. What may ſeem to make againſt our cauſe, in this Epiſtle, is, that he ſaith, *quod autem unus electus quem cæteris præponeretur id in Schiſmatis remedium factum*, which he ſaith was, *ne unusquiſque Eccleſiam ad ſe trahens, Chriſti eccleſiam rumperet*; which was done, ſaith he, in *Alexandria*, *a Marci Temporibus*. This may well be underſtood of a Moderator of their Meetings, who had power of Convening the *Presbyters*, leaſt every one might call a Meeting of them at his pleaſure; and ſo breed confuſion; and it muſt be ſo underſtood; not of a *Biſhop* with ſole juriſdiction; unleſs we will make *Jerom* to contradict the whole ſtrain and deſign of this Epiſtle. Another paſſage is, *quid enim facit Epiſcopus præter Ordinationem, quod non facit Presbyter*: Which cannot be underſtood of *Ordination*, or *ſole Ordination* of *Presbyters*; for that were to make a material difference between *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*; which is directly contrary to his whole Diſcourſe; but *Ordination* here, muſt be, ordering of their Meetings; which is the part of the Senior or Moderator. One might alſo alledge, that in the Writings of this learned Father, a paſſage, *Obiter* ſet down, is not to be taken notice of, in prejudice of the Scope and Strain of his Diſcourſe, tho' they be inconſiſtent: and might ground this allegation on the account that he giveth of his own Writings, and cited alſo by Dr. *Stillingfleet, Irenicum*, p. 278. *Itaque ut ſimpliciter fatear, legi hac omnia, & in meme mea plurima conſervans, accito notario, vel mea, vel aliena dictavi, nec ordinis, nec verborum, interdum nec ſenſuum memor.*

Sect. 16. Another Teſtimony is alſo out of *Jerom*, *comment. in Tit.* 1. where he inſiſteth at length on the ſame ſubject, and aſſerteth the ſame opinion as before. *Idem ergo* (ſaith he) *Presbyter*

qui Epiſcopus, & antequam diaboli inſtinctu ſtudia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, Ego ſum Pauli, ego Appollo, ego Cephæ (alluding to the Schiſm mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 3. not meaning it in particular, as ſome fanſy) *Communi Presbyterorum concilio eccleſia gubernabatur; poſtquam vero unusquiſque eos quos Baptizaverat ſuos putabat eſſe, non Chriſti, toto orbe decretum eſt, Ut unus de Presbyteris electis ſuperponeretur reliquis, ad quem omnis eccleſiæ cura pertineret, ut Schiſmatum ſemina tollerentur*; and for proof of the Identity of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, he citeth many Scriptures, as above; and ſheweth, that *Biſhop* denoteth the Office, *Presbyter* the Age. He citeth alſo, *Heb.* 13. 17. *Ibi* (ſaith he) *equaliter inter plures eccleſiæ cura dividitur.* And after he ſheweth the difference between *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, to be *magis conſuetudine quam diſpoſitionis dominicæ veritate.* And in concluſion of that diſcourſe, making a Tranſition to the qualities that the Text mentioneth; ſaith, *videamus igitur qualis Presbyter, ſive Epiſcopus, ordinandus ſit.* What *Jerom* ſaith, *toto orbe decretum eſt*, is not to be underſtood of the Decree of an *Oecumenick Council*, for no ſuch Decree can be produced; but that this Remedy of Schiſm in many places, began then to be thought on; and it was no wonder that this Corruption began then to creep in; it being then about the end of the Fourth Century, when *Jerom* wrote. And this remedy *Jerom* declareth was not of God's, but of Mans inventing; and accordingly it ſucceeded; for it proved worſe than the Diſeaſe, bringing in Tyranny, and overturning Chriſt's Inſtitution; and at laſt ſetting up the *Man of Sin.* Satan gave the occaſion to it, as *Jerom* ſaith, Man gave a Being to it, and Satan improved it to carry on his deſigns. The *omnis eccleſiæ cura*, that he mentioneth is inconſiſtent with the *cura inter plures equaliter diviſa*, which, he ſaith, was the way of the Goſpel; and therefore either we muſt make *Jerom* ſay, That the practice in his days was a direct overturning of Chriſt's Inſtitution, and contrary to Apoſtolick practice, which will make the way of the Primitive *Church*, and Writings of the Fathers to be no good Commentary upon the inſtitution and way of the Apoſtles times; and ſo deſtroy the Argument that our Brethren inſiſt moſt upon for *Epiſcopacy*; or we muſt expound this *omnis cura* of the extent of it to the whole *Church*, not of the ſolitude of it in one Man, excluding the reſt of the *Presbyters*, that he had a ſpecial inſpection, though he might not exerciſe Diſcipline by himſelf.

Sect. 17. A third Teſtimony out of *Jerom*, is *Ep. ad Heliodorum*, *Fol.* (*mihi*) 283. ſpeaking of the Dignity of a *Presbyter*, and ſhewing

ing that they have power to consecrate the Eucharist; they have *claves Regni Cœlorum & quodammodo diem judicij indicant*, and then addeth, *Illi* (Presbytero) *si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanæ.* Sure then he is not for sole jurisdiction of a Bishop. And this he speaketh of the principle and practice of his time; which confirmeth what I said before of the meaning of *Omnis cura ecclesiæ.* There is yet another place in *Jerom* that is plain to this purpose, *Ep. ad Demet. Sunt quos ecclesia reprehendit; quos interdum abjicit; in quos nonnunquam Episcoporum & Clericorum censura desævit*; which clearly putteth the Censures of the *Church* in his days, into the Hands of *Presbyters*, and not into the Hands of *Bishops* only, whatever Priority they had above the other. It is worth our Observation, that several *Popish* Writers (as zealous for *Prelacy* as ours are) confess such light in the Writings of *Jerom* to this purpose, that they find no way to Answer, but to Condemn him of Error in this matter. And *Bellarm. de clericis, lib. 1. c. 15.* confesseth that *Sedulius & Anselmus ad verbum retulerunt Hieronymi sententiam, In Comment. in Tit. 1.* If any reject the Testimony of *Jerom*, because he was a *Presbyter*, and no *Bishop*, I hope they will allow us the like liberty, to reject the Testimonies that they bring of them, who themselves were *Bishops*; and then let them reckon their Gain, when the Suffrages of the Ancients are brought to the Poll.

Sect. 18. Other Testimonies I shall mention more briefly. *Tertul. Apolog. c. 34.* speaking of *Excommunications*, and other Censures, saith, they are done in the Assemblies, and that *præsident probati quique seniores. Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. lib. 7. pœnes Presbyteros est disciplina quæ homines facit meliores*: Both these wrote in the beginning of the Third Century. Wherefore Discipline in that Age was exercised in common, and every Assembly had its president, with power of Discipline. *Ambrosius* who wrote in the end of the Fourth Century, when no little Deviation had been made from the right way; yet sheweth the *Church* could not then bear *sole jurisdiction*; for a Sentence past'd by *Syagrius* was disliked, *quia sine alicujus fratris consilio.* But *Ambrose* passing Sentence in the same cause, was approved, *quia cum fratribus, & consacerdotibus participatum processit, Ambros. Ep. ad Syagrium*: And even *Cyprian*, as great an Asserter of Episcopal Primacy, as that age could bear, *Ep. 12. 46.* joineth the Clergy with the *Bishop* in receiving the Lapsed on their Repentance. I next adduce the learned and excellent *Augustine*, as a Witness of this Truth, *Ep. 19. ad Hieron. Quamquam enim honorum vocabula quæ jam ecclesiæ usu obtinuit Episcopus, Presbytero major sit:*

He maketh the *Biſhop Major*, not Lord over the *Presbyter*; and even that Majority, was but by the Cuſtom of the *Church*, not divine Ordinance, and a cuſtom that had now obtained, was not always. Alſo, *lib. quæſt. com.* he proveth from, 1 *Tim.* 3. *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* to be one; and ſaith, *quid eſt enim Epiſcopus niſi Presbyter*, and this Oneneſs he further ſheweth, becauſe *Biſhops* (ſuch as then were; to wit, in the beginning of the Fifth Century, when the Order of the *Church* was much changed) called the *Presbyters*, *Compresbyteri*, but never called the *Deacons*, *Condiaconi*, *Presbyter* and *Biſhop* being the ſame Office, but *Deacons* being diſtinct from them both. The laſt Teſtimony ſhall be that of *Chryſoſtom*, in 1 Tim. 3. homil. 11. *Inter Epiſcopum atque Presbyterum intereſt fere nihil; quippe & Presbyteris eccleſiæ cura permiſſa eſt; & quæ de Epiſcopis dicuntur, ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt; ſola quippe ordinatione ſuperiores illi ſunt.* *Bellarm.* ſaith that *Primaſius*, *Theophilactus*, and *Oecumenius* on that Text, teach the ſame things, and almoſt in the ſame words: And the Second of theſe lived in the end of the Ninth Century; the laſt in the Tenth or Eleventh. The Anſwer that *Bellarm.* giveth to this, is not worth taking notice of; to wit, *Chryſoſt.* meaneth, that *Presbyters* have juriſdiction, as *Biſhops* have, but only by Commiſſion from the *Biſhop*: This is directly contrary to the Scope of his Diſcourſe, which is to ſhew an Identity of them, as they are in themſelves. What he alledgeth out of this Citation; that a *Biſhop* may ordain, not a *Presbyter*, the learned Father's expreſſion will not bear; for *Ordination* muſt ſignifie either the *Ordination* the *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* have, whereby they are put in their Office, to be different; which he doth not alledge; or that the difference between them was only in order, or precedency, not in Power or any Authority; or that it was by the *Ordination*, or appointment of the *Church* not Chriſt's Inſtitution; but it can never ſignifie the power of ordaining; for then Chriſt (who was ſufficiently a Maſter of words) would have ſaid, *poteſtate ordinandi*, not *Ordinatione*.

Sect. 19. I conclude this one ground of ſcruple at the preſent *Epiſcopacy* with 3 Conſiderations; which tho they be not concludent in themſelves, being but humane Teſtimonies; yet may abate a little of our brethrens confidence in aſſerting their Opinion about *Biſhops*, to have always been the ſentiments of the *Catholick Church*. The, 1 is, That *Lombard* and moſt of the School-Men deny the diſtinction of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, lib. 4. diſt. 24. liter. *I.* He telleth us that the Canons do only mention the orders of *Presbyters* and

and *Deacons*; because the primitive *Church* had only these; and of these only we have the Apostles Commandment; the rest were after appointed by the *Church*. And *ibid. litera* M. he sheweth that the orders of *Bishop*, *Arch-Bishop*, &c. the *Church* borrowed from the distinction of the Heathen *Flamins*, *Horum autem discretio* (saith he) *a gentilibus introducta videtur*. Both *Cajetan* on *Tit.* 1. and *Estius* on the place of *Lombard* now cited, deny the Divine Right of *Episcopacy*. The 2 Consideration, is, That the *Waldenses*, *Albigenses*, *Wickliff* and his Followers, and all they that under the darkness of *Popery* maintained the same Doctrins that the *Protestants* now professs, were of a Parity among Presbyters, and disallowed of *Diocesan Bishops*. This is confessed by *Medina*, and is not denyed by *Bellarm.* and any that read what is written of their Opinions will acknowledge this; it is among *Wickliff*'s Errors imputed to him by *Tho. Waldensis*, that in the Apostles times there were only 2 Orders, *Priests* and *Deacons*, and that a *Bishop* doth not differ from a *Priest*, *Fuller Ch. Hist. lib.* 4. *cent.* 14. p. 132. Let not any impute this to their persecuted State; for we know *Papists* have always had their *Titular Bishops*, where their Religion was suppressed. The third thing that I offer to be considered, is, The observation of *Spanhemius*, a most diligent searcher into the History of the *Ancient Church*, in his *Epitom. Isagog. ad Hist. N.T. sæculo* 2. V. 5. Where he moveth a doubt, whether then there was *Episcopus Præses* only in the greater *Churches*; whether it was only *Præsidentia Ministerii non imperii*, as *Tertul. de pudicitia*, c. 25. or only a reverence to their age, and their conversing with the Apostles, and whether it did not with the defection of after ages receive addition.

SECT. IV.

The Dr's Arguments for Episcopacy Answered.

I Return now to the reverend Dr. to hear what he will say for this *Episcopacy* that we scruple, on the forementioned grounds. I begin with his first undertaking above mentioned; to wit, to shew *That our Diocesan Episcopacy is the same in substance which was in the Primitive Church.* And this he laboureth to prove concerning the *African Churches*, in the times of *Cyprian* and *Augustine*, and the *Church* of *Alexandria* in the time of *Athanasius* and of

of the Church of *Cyprus* in the days of *Theodoret*. Concerning all this in general; I make two obſervations before I come to examine his particular Allegations, 1. That his phraſe is ambiguous, that their *Epiſcopacy* was the ſame in *Subſtance* with ours: I wiſh he had ſhewed what is that *Subſtance* of *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy* that he findeth in both. I think the *Subſtance* of our *Engliſh Epiſcopacy* is, that one Man hath ſole *Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction* over all the *Church-Officers* and Members in many Congregations; if he will ſhew us that in the Primitive Times, let him rejoice in his Argument from Antiquity. 2. The *Antiquity* that the Dr. here pretendeth to, is far ſhort of that which himſelf and others do boaſt of with a great deal of Confidence; ſome of them tell us of a clear Deduction that they can make of it down from the Apoſtles in all ages without Interruption, ſome make it of more than 1500 years ſtanding; but the *Dr.* here is not pleaſed to pretend to that. *Cyprian* lived in the Third Century, *Athanaſius* in the Fourth, *Auguſtine* and *Theodoret* in the Fifth, and it may eaſily be granted that there was a great degeneracy in *Church*-Diſcipline and Government by that time; yet that *Epiſcopacy* was arrived at that heighth that is now in *England*, even at that time, we deny.

Sect. 2. To prove what he had undertaken, he layeth down two Obſervations. 1. That *it was an inviolable rule among them, that but one Biſhop was to be in one Church.* I am little concerned in this, though I ſee no rule for it, except a Canon of *Concil. Cabilonenſ.* which was but Provincial, and very late, under *Pope Eugenius*, about *Ann.* 654, yet I think it was generally and rationally practiſed for taking a *Biſhop* for the προεδρος among the *Presbyters*, (which I affirm to have been the Dialect of thoſe times.) What needed more *Biſhops* than one, ſeeing all the *Presbyters* of one City might conveniently meet ordinarily for the Exerciſe of Diſcipline. When Mr. *B.* proveth the contrary, he taketh *Biſhop* in the Apoſtles ſence, and then I affirm with him that there were more *Biſhops* in one City, that every Aſſembly for worſhip had one, if not more. The *Dr*'s. Argument that he ſeemeth to glory in, p. 246. is of no value; it is, That *if more Biſhops than one could be in a City, the Schiſm of the* Donatiſts *and* Novatians *might have been prevented*; this is either a great miſtake, or ſomewhat elſe; for taking *Biſhops* for *Moderators* of *Presbytery*, the bare ſetting up of two *Presbyteries*, and two *Moderators* could not have prevented theſe Schiſms; and if the *Church* had found it convenient to divide them, retain-

retaining the ſame Principles of Faith, and about Church-Order and Diſcipline, there had been no Schiſm: It is moſt falſe that theſe Schiſms were meerly about the plurality of *Biſhops* in a City. The Schiſm of the *Donatiſts* had its riſe at *Carthage* from the Ambition of *Donatus*, who oppoſed the election of *Cecilianus*; the pretence was, that he had been ordained by a *Proditor*, and that he had admitted another *Proditor* to Eccleſiaſtical Office; *Cecilianus* being Tried, and Acquitted, both by the *Emperor* and the *Church* in ſeveral Councils, *Donatus* and his party ſet up another *Church*, an Elderſhip, and People, in oppoſition to *Cecilianus*, diſclaiming the diſcipline of *Cecilianus*, and his Party, in admiting the lapſed upon repentance, and admitting the wicked as they alledged to the Sacraments. So that it is plain, that the Schiſm lay in this, That they ſet up another *Church-way* and Order, and conſequentially to that, ſet up another *Biſhop* and *Presbytery*, not beſide, but in oppoſition to that which was before, and that without ſufficient reaſon; upon the very like occaſion did *Novatus ſeparate* from *Cornelius Biſhop* at *Rome*, and ſet up a new *Church* on the foreſaid grounds. *Cyprian* indeed condemneth *Novatus*, and nullifieth his *Church-Power*, becauſe *poſt primum ſecundus eſſe non poteſt*; but this is ſtill to be underſtood of ſetting up another *Biſhop*, or meeting of *Presbyters* under a *Preſident* without the Authority of the *Church*, or good cauſe for ſo doing. It is evident then, that theſe Schiſms were built on another Foundation than what the *Dr.* ſuppoſeth, and that they could not have been prevented if forty *Biſhops* had been allowed in a City; as long as *Donatus* and *Novatus* retained their Principles, they would have ſeparated from all *Biſhops* and *Churches* that were not of their way; all that followeth in this his firſt Obſervation is eaſily Anſwered in one Word, to wit, that all theſe Citations prove no more than this, that where a *Church* was ſetled, and ſufficiently furniſhed (whether you take it for a ſingle Congregation, or more Congregations aſſociate for Diſcipline with *a Preſident*) it was not fit for any to diſturb that Unity by ſetting up another *Church*, whether of the one, or the other ſort mentioned.

Sect. 3. His ſecond Obſervation is, *That in Cities and Dioceſſes which were under the care of one Biſhop, there were ſeveral Congregations and Altars, and diſtant places.* I contend not about the word *Dioceſs*, ſuppoſing that one *Preſident* of an Aſſembly of *Presbyters*, with theſe *Presbyters* might have ruling power over many particu-

lar

lar *Churches*; call that Diſtrict by what name he will, the matter is not great: Our queſtion is not about the Name, but the Power by which that Diſtrict was ruled, whether it were in one Man or in the body of *Presbyters*. But it is well known that *Dioceſs*, which now ſignifieth a *Church Diviſion*, did in thoſe days ſignifie a *Civil Diviſion* of the *Roman Empire* made by *Conſtantine* the Great, who divided the hundred Provinces of the *Empire* into 14 *Dioceſſes*, where all *Africk* was but one; ſee for this *Heylin, Coſmogr. lib.* 1. p. 54. And it is as well known that *Dioceſs* did often Signifie a Pariſh or people of a Pariſh; neither do I contend about the word *Altar*, ſuppoſing the *Dr.* meaneth, places where the Lords Supper was Celebrated. Both *Origen* and *Arnobius* affirm that 200 years after Chriſt, the Chriſtians were blamed by the Heathens, becauſe they had no *Altars*; the name of *Altar* was not uſed in the *Church* till the Third Century, and not then neither, but figuratively: But the *Dr.* loveth to ſpeak of *Ancient things* in his *Modern Dialect*, borrowed from the more corrupted times of the *Church*.

Sect. 4. For his Obſervation it ſelf, I ſhall not contend about it, tho' I think he will hardly anſwer what is ſaid againſt it, *No Evid. for Dioceſs*, p. 15. For it maketh nothing againſt what I hold, unleſs he prove that the *Biſhop* had the ſole Power, or had juriſdiction over the *Presbyters* in that Diſtrict which he calleth a *Dioceſs*. What he ſaith that ſeemeth to be Argumentative to this purpoſe, I ſhall mind, and no more: The multitude and diſtance of places that he inſtanceth (tho' all were true, the contrary of which the forecited Author maketh appear) will not prove Superiority of power in one Man; neither *Auguſtine*'s care for Neighbouring Places that wanted Miniſters, either to provide Miniſters for them, or to Baptize them, or do other Church Acts for them in their need. This proveth neither Extenſion, nor Solitude of Power; far leſs doth *Cyprian*'s nameing *Provincia noſtra*, in which were many *Biſkops*, prove him to have been a *Metropolitan*; the *Empire* was divided into Provinces. If a Miniſter in *England* ſhould ſay there are many Miniſters in our Country, it will not prove that they were under his Charge. *Vuler* mentioneth *Creſcens* who had 120 Biſhops under him; the *Dr.* ſhould have proved that he had ſole juriſdiction over them, and all their *Churches*, or that he could act any thing in *Church* matters without them; and ſo that he was more than preſident in their meeting, when they came together about the Affairs of the *Church*. Theſe are the Goodly Arguments

from

from *Antiquity*, by which Men think to wreath on our Necks the Yoak of *Domination*.

Sect. 5. He bringeth another proof for his *Dioceſan Biſhop*, *Sect.* 20. from *Athanaſius* his having charge over the *Church* of *Alexandria*, and theſe of *Maræotis*. And 1. *Epiphamus* ſaith, that *Athanaſius* did often viſit Neighbour *Churches*, eſpecially thoſe of *Maræotis*. *Anſ.* So have many *Presbyterian* Miniſters done to Neighbouring Pariſhes that were deſtitute, and yet never pretended to Epiſcopal Power over them; That this was an Act of Charity, not of Epiſcopal Authority appeareth, becauſe *Epiphamus* calleth them Neighbour *Churches*, not a part of *Athanaſius's Church*, and that he mentioneth other Neighbour *Churches* beſides theſe of *Maræotis*, which *Athanaſius* ſaith were ſubject to him. Next, *Athanaſius* ſaith *Maræotis* is a region belonging to *Alexandria*, which never had neither *Biſhop* nor *Suffragan* in it, but all the *Churches* there are immediately ſubject to the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*; but every Presbyter is fixed in his particular Village. *Anſ. Maræotis* or *Maria*, as *Ptolomy* calleth it, is a Lake not far from *Alexandria* now called *Lago Diaxon*; I ſuppoſe *Athanaſius* means the Country about that Lake, which it ſeems had then few *Churches*, and Chriſtians, and therefore it was very fit they ſhould Aſſociate for Diſcipline, with theſe of *Alexandria*, being very near to it; their Subjection to the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* doth not prove his ſole juriſdiction over them, but only that they were ſo by the Aſſociation of *Presbyters*, of which the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* was Moderator. Subjection to a *Biſhop* in our days ſignifieth to be under his Juriſdiction by himſelf, becauſe men have ſet up ſuch *Biſhops*; but it cannot be made to ſignifie the ſame in the *Dialect* of theſe times, unleſs it were *Aliunde* proved that they were ſuch *Biſhops*, which is not done by ſuch an Argument as this; wherefore I deny the *Drs*, third Conſequence that he draweth from this paſſage, p. 254. to wit, *That theſe were under the mediate inſpection of the Biſhop of* Alexandria, *ſo that the whole Government belongeth to him.* There is not the leſt ſhadow of reaſon for ſuch an inference; his diſputation that followeth about the Chriſtians of *Alexandria* meeting in Diverſe Aſſemblies, I meddle not with, it is nothing againſt us, whether it were ſo or otherwiſe.

Sect. 6. The laſt proof that he bringeth, is out of *Theodoret*, which he ſaith, *is plain enough of it ſelf to ſhew the great extent of Dioceſan Power*; he ſaith, *he had the paſtoral charge of* 800. (he would

ſhould have ſaid 80) *Churches, and that ſo many Pariſhes were in his Dioceſs.* The *Dr.* inſulteth much on this Teſtimony, but without cauſe; for 1. *Theodoret* lived in the fifth century, and we deny not but by that time Epiſcopal Ambition had in ſome places encroached on the Government inſtituted by Chriſt, and which had been kept more intire in former Ages. 2. It is much ſuſpected by learned Men, that *Theodorets* Epiſtles are not genuine, and the *Dr.* doth not deny that Hereticks had feigned Epiſtles in *Theodorets* name, as *Leontius* ſaith, which doth darogate much from the credit of theſe that cannot be well proved to be true. 3. *Theodoret* doth not ſay that he had the Paſtoral charge of theſe *Churches*, but that he had been Paſtor in them; the former Expreſſion looketh like a ſole power in him, and therefore the *Dr.* thought fit ſo to vary the phraſe; the other hinteth no more power then is conſiſtant with a party, every Miniſter being a Paſtor in the *Churches* to whoſe Aſſociation he belongeth. 4. But whatever be in that, this ſheweth the extent of *Theodorets* Power, as to place or bounds, but doth not prove that he alone exerciſed that power, and therefore is no proof of a *Dioceſan Biſhop.*

Sect. 7. Before I proceed, I ſhall return to examine the *Doctor's* Allegations for *Dioceſan* Power, *p.* 230. which I above referred to this place. He aſſerteth, *That the Presbyters and whole Church were under the particular Care and Government of* Cyprian: This Aſſertion is too big for the *Proofs* that he bringeth for it; *to wit*, That *Cyprian* reproveth ſome of the *Presbyters* for receiving Penitents without conſulting him, and complaineth of the Affront done to his Place, as Biſhop, and diſchargeth the like to be done for the future. *Lucian* ſaith, that the Martyrs had agreed that the Lapſed ſhould be received on Repentance; but their Cauſe was to be heard before the Biſhop, and ſeveral Paſſages to this purpoſe. To all which, *I. A.* by denying the Conſequence; *Cyprian* as I cited above, did not take on him to receive the Lapſed without the *Presbyters*: Will it thence follow that he had no Power at all? But it was ſolely in them; even ſo, that the *Presbyters* (eſpecially that ſome of them, as the *Dr.* himſelf ſtates the Caſe) might not do it without *Cyprian*, doth not prove that the *Presbyters*, and whole *Church*, were under his Government. It amounteth to no more but this, that in a *Presbytery* regularly conſtituted, eſpecially, where they have devolved the Power of calling, and preſiding in their Meetings on a fixed, and conſtant Moderator, it is very irregular that a part

ſhould

ſhould meet about Diſcipline, without the reſt, and particularly, without Conſulting him whom they have ſo choſen. Beſide, I will not deny but *Cyprian* ſheweth too much Zeal in this Cauſe, and might poſſibly attempt to ſtretch his Power a little too far, as afterward many did: He was a holy and meek Man, but ſuch may be a little too high. To this ſame purpoſe are his other Citations of *Moſes* and *Maximus*, commending *Cyprian* for not being wanting to his Office. *Cyprian's* Epiſtle to the Clergy of *Carthage*, that the *Dr.* citeth, ſheweth there were Diſorders committed in the Matter of receiving the Lapſed; in that not only ſome *Presbyters* took it on them, without a regular Meeting of the whole, but even Deacons medled with it, which was out of their way. His Citation of the *Roman Clergy* commending the Martyrs for not taking on them the Diſcipline of the *Church*, is wholly out of the way; for none ever ſuppoſed that every Martyr had *Church*-Power. That they delayed ſome parts of Diſcipline till they had a new *Biſhop*, proveth as little as the reſt; for it is fit one ſhould moderate in their Meetings, and Cuſtom had obtained that he ſhould be fixed in that Office, which was not from the beginning. *Cyprians* appointing ſome to viſit, when he could not do it by reaſon of Perſecution, neither is a precedent for our *Biſhops* doing their Work by Delegates when they are at eaſe; nor doth it prove that theſe did any thing without the *Presbyters*; that *Cyprian* citeth *tu es Petrus*; and whatſoever you ſhall bind, *&c.* was to very good purpoſe, when ſome Martyrs invaded the Diſcipline of the *Church*; and i proveth, that as *Chriſt* gave the power of the Keys to *Peter*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles, not to the People; ſo he had given it to *Cyprian* and the reſt of the *Presbyters*, not to the Martyrs. It had been well if *tu es Petrus* had never been more abuſed. He ſaith indeed, that the *Church* hath ever been governed by Biſhops, but the *Dr.* muſt prove that he meaneth, by Biſhops alone, as they are diſtinct and ſeparate from the other *Presbyters*: The reſt that followeth, that the *Biſhop* is to govern, and give Account to God, that he is in the place of Chriſt; that a *Church* is a People united to a *Biſhop*, do all agree very well, either with a Congregational *Biſhop*, or Miniſter; or a Presbyterian Moderator, acting in parity with other *Presbyters*; and yet theſe are the *Herculean* Arguments from Antiquity, that men make ſuch a noiſe with.

Sect. 8. I now proceed with the *Dr.* to the third Thing, that he had undertaken; *to wit*, to prove, *That ſuch an Epiſcopacy as is practiſed*

ct, ſed here, and was ſo in the Primitive Church, (this Laſt he ſuppoſeth that he hath proved) *is no deviſing a new ſpecies of Churches, nor repugnant to any Inſtitution of Chriſt.* To prove which, *Sect.* 11. he bringeth ſome of Mr. *B*'s Conceſſions, which I neither yield, nor will vindicate. He bringeth alſo ſome Arguments of Mr. *B*'s to prove that the ordinary governing part of the Apoſtolick Office was ſetled in all Ages: Wherefore, I muſt, for a little, leave the *Dr.* and Anſwer theſe Arguments of Mr. *B*'s: But firſt, I take notice, that it is a Miſtake in the *Dr.* and Mr. *B.* too, to call the governing part of the Apoſtle's Office ordinary: For 1. That is, to ſuppoſe the Thing in queſtion; *to wit*, that it was continued in the *Church*; that they governed, and preached, is true; but that Officers that after were imployed in governing, or preaching, can claim that power as ſucceeding to the Apoſtles in any part of their Office; and without other warrant we deny. The Apoſtles governed, and preached by another Commiſſion from Chriſt, than men now do; and that both, as to the manner of it, the one being immediate, the other mediate; and as to the matter of it, their Commiſſion warranted them to do many Acts in governing, and preaching, that others have no power to do, as giving Authoritative rules to all *Churches* where they came; ordaining, and cenſureing every where, going up and down to Preach every where, without a call from any *Church*, without being fixed any where; this power no Man can now pretend to: Wherefore I ſay, that Miniſters Teach and Rule the *Church* not by vertue of Apoſtolick Office, or any part of it committed to them, but by vertue of another Office, diſtinct from that of the Apoſtles which they receive by their Ordination. 2. It is evident that the Apoſtles governing Power was not ordinary, becauſe there was an ordinary governing Power in the *Church* even in the Apoſtles times, diſtinct from that of the Apoſtles, and exerciſed by other Men; tho' in ſubordination to the Apoſtles governing Power. The *Presbytery* did then Ordain, they did alſo Excommunicate, as was above ſhewed, and the Apoſtles directed them ſo to do; and ſometimes concurred with them, and ſometimes they acted without them.

Sect. 9. Let us now hear Mr. *B*s. Arguments, 1. *We read* (ſaith he, *Chriſt direct.* pt. 3. *Queſtion*, 56. p. 831.) *Of the ſetling of that form* (viz. general Officers as well as particular) *but we never read of any Abſolution, Diſcharge, or Ceſſation of the Inſtitution.* Anſ. 1. If this Argument have any force, it will prove the continuance of

of

of all the extraordinary Offices that ever were in the *Church*, *Prophets*, *Evangeliſts*, *Workers of Miracles*, &c. For we read not that ever they were diſcharged. *Anſ.* 2. It is enough to Aboliſh and Diſcharge that Inſtitution, that this Office was ſetled in the perſons of ſome Men, immediately by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf; and after their deceaſe, He neither put others in their room immediately by himſelf, nor gave the *Church* any hint that ſuch a thing ſhould be done; but inſtead of that, he hath given ſufficient direction for propogating other Officers in the *Church* in all Ages. Argument 2. *If we affirm a Ceſſation without proof, we ſeem to accuſe God of Mutabillity, as ſetling one form of Government for one Age only, and no longer. Anſ.* I hope Mr. *B.* will not ſay that a change in Gods Works, yea, or Inſtitutions, doth argue mutability in God, are not all the Old Teſtament Inſtitutions now changed? Were not Prophets, Evangeliſts, Men gifted with divers tongues, *&c.* His Inſtitutions, and yet now ceaſed, and no other proof can be given for their Ceſſation then what we give for the ceaſing of Apoſtles. Neither do we ſay they are ceaſed without proof, that they were by immediate Commiſſion from God; that that now cannot be pretended to, and that the Lord hath hinted no other way of continuing ſuch an Office in his Houſe, nor that it ſhould be continued, is abundant proof of this Ceſſation. Argument 3. *We leave room for audacious Wits, accordingly to queſtion other Goſpel Inſtitutions, as Paſtors, Sacraments,* &c. *and to ſay that they were but for an Age. Anſ.* There is not the leaſt ſhew of reaſon for this: for their Goſpel Inſtitutions have more abiding Warrant then Immediate Commiſſion given by Chriſt to ſome to Adminiſter them. Argument. 4. *It was General Officers that Chriſt promiſed to be with to the end of the World,* Ma. h. 28. 20. *Anſ.* 1. If this Argument prove any thing, it proveth too much; to wit, that only General Officers have that promiſe which I hope Mr. *B.* will not ſay. *Anſ.* 2. It was ſpoken to General Officers, but the promiſe is not made to them alone, but to all that ſhould be Imployed in the work of Teaching, and Baptizing. And theſe being particularly here mentioned, will prove that there ſhall be Teachers and Baptizers to the end of the World; but not that there ſhall be General Officers, as the *Metropolitans*, &c. that Mr. *B.* dreameth of to the end of the World.

Sect. 10. The *Dr.* to improve theſe Arguments of Mr. *B.* to his purpoſe, joineth with him *th conſent of the Age, ſucceedin;*

&c.

the Apostles that the Apostles did leave successors in the care of Government of the Churches. Auf. Who doubteth of that; but the question is, to whom did the Apostles commit this care? we say to the Pastors in Common, he saith to *Diocesan Bishops*, this we deny that it can be proved, either from any Writing or Deed of the Apostles, or from the consent of the Ages next after them; that the *Bishops* were looked on as succeeding to the Appostles in the Government of *Churches*; we deny not (tho' we deny that they had that Office, or any part of it) but then the question is, whether they alone who in the 2. or 3. Century began to get the name of *Bishops* appropriate to them, had that Government by themselves, or in Common with the rest of the Presbyters, unless the *Dr.* prove the former, he speaketh not to the point. None hath better proved the contrary of what is here held by the *Dr.* then he himself, *Iren.* p. 308. to wit, *That not Bishops alone, but all Presbyters succeeded to the Apostles*, and that by Testimonies out of *Cyprian*, *Ierom*, and *Ignatius*.

Sect. 11. He undertaketh to prove that the *English Episcopacy* doth not take away the whole Power of *Presbyters*, as some alledge: And that therefore it maketh no new Species of Government from what Christ Instituted, or was read in the Ancient *Church*. We do not alledge that it taketh away the whole power of *Presbyters*, for that were to reduce them into the same order with the rest of the people; but we say it usurpeth an undue power over them, that neither Christ nor the *Primitive Church* ever allowed, in taking out of their hand that power of Governing the *Church* that they have equal with the *Bishop*; and in other things to be observed in our progess. In order to makeing out what he alledgeth, he proposeth two things to be enquired into, *Sect.* 12. First, *What power is left to Presbyters in our Church.* 2. *What Authority the Bishops have over them.* For the first, *he asserteth their power in reference to the whole body of the Church, and that because they have a place in the convocation, where rules of Discipline, Articles of Doctrine, and forms of Service are determined.* How small a matter this is (tho' the *Dr.* aggravateth it) I do with him appeal to any Man of understanding who is unbyassed, and who knoweth the constitution of an *English Convocation*; it consisteth of two Houses, in the upper House are only *Bishops*, and let the lower House never so unanimously vote for a thing, they can reject it; that is, 25 Men who by the Laws of the Gospel, have no more power then

any

any other 25 of near 9000 (ſo many *Churchs* are reckoned in *England*) take to themſelves as much power as all theſe. Then for the lower Houſe of the Convocation, it is made up of Presbyters indeed, as the *Dr.* ſaith; but many, if not moſt of them, ſuch as by no Law of Chriſt have more power to ſit there than any others have, as *Deans*, *Arch-deacons*, and other Cathedral Officers; here alſo the *Presbyters* are bereaved of that party of power that is their due; beſides that few of the inferior *Presbyters* are admitted, often not above two or four in a Dioceſs. If then their power be not ſwallowed up by the *Biſhops*, and their Creatures in the Convocation, let any judge: He next proveth the power by the hand that they have in *Ordination*, or giving *Orders*, as he calleth it, to wit, *That by the Rules of this Church, four Presbyters are to aſſiſt the Biſhop, and are to examine the perſons to be ordained (or the Biſhop in their preſence) and to join the Impoſition of hands.* Here alſo their power is ſwallowed up, for all the reſt have equal power with theſe four, yea, with the *Biſhop* himſelf, which is wholly taken out of their hands, and managed at the *Biſhops* pleaſure, who chuſeth theſe four, beſide, that this is really, if ever practiſed, the perſon is uſually examined, or ſaid to be ſo by the *Biſhops* Chaplain, and the *Biſhop* layeth his hands on him.

Sect. 12. Next he telleth us what power *Presbyters* have in their particular Charges, p. 267. which he leaveth us to gather from 3 topicks. The Epiſtle that is read at the Ordination of a Presbyter, to wit, *Act.* 20. or 1 *Tim.* 3. *What an impertinency* (ſaith the *Dr.*) *had both theſe been, if the Presbyters power had been ſwallowed up by the Biſhop.* A goodly Argument, ſome think it a great Impertinency, and Boldneſs too, in the face of theſe Scriptures to make a diſtinction, as to any part of *Church* Power, between a *Presbyter* and a *Biſhop*! His next topick is, the *Biſhops* Exhortation at the Ordination, where *he telleth them of the dignity of the Office, and greatneſs of the Charge, calleth them Paſtors, that they are to Teach, Premoniſh and Feed, and provide for the Lords Family*, &c. This indeed implyeth their Preaching Power, but there is not a word of Ruling Power, which the Lord joyned with it, but the *Biſhops* do ſeparate them; and for all this ſaying over their cold Leſſon at the Solemnity, the *Biſhops* will not ſuffer the *Presbyter* to Preach by vertue of this Ordination without *Licenſe*; ſo that their Ruleing Power is taken away, and their Preaching Power reſtrained at the *Biſhops* pleaſure. This is a croſſing of Chriſts Inſtitution,

who

who made them equal; neither is it any more wonder that the *Bishops* practice should cross his own Exhortation, then that he should cross the Scripture, read on that occasion. His third Topick, is the ordained Persons Oath, *to minister Word and Sacraments, and Discipline, as this Realm hath received the same.* Here Discipline is *pro forma* mentioned; but the following words shew the meaning, for this Realm hath not received Christ's Discipline to be exercised by the Officers, into whose hands he put it, but the *Dr.* acknowledgeth little less then I say, when he saith, *That the general care of Government and Discipline is committed to the Bishop*; I hope the Reader will by this time see, that the *Presbyters* in the *Church of England*, have not all that power left to them that Christ gave to his Ministers; and therefore the *English Episcopacy* is another kind of *Church Government*, than that which Christ Instituted, or the purer primitive times knew.

Sect. 13. The other thing he proposeth, is, *Sect.* 13. to shew *what Authority the Bishop hath by his Consecration*, which he placeth in *Government*, *Ordination*, and *Censures*; and he saith, *the Church of* England *did believe that Bishops did succeed the Apostles in these parts of their Office.* This I deny not, but the *Dr.* should have proved that the *Church* of *England* had ground to believe so. Mr. *B.* concession will not oblige us to be of the same mind; that she did believe so, I am not convinced from what he bringeth in proof of it, but the contrary I have proved above, wherefore I shall take no further notice of this Section except to examine his notion, p. 269. on which he seemeth to value himself very highly; it is that *in the Apostles times they managed the Government of the Church themselves, and therefore there was no Bishop, but Bishops, and Presbyters were one; but as the Apostles went off, Bishops came to be settled in the several Churches, whom the Apostles setled some sooner, some later; if which* (saith he) *we have an incontrouleable evidence in* Timothy *and* Titus. And by this he would reconcile the different Testimonies of *Antiquity*, the Succession of *Bishops* from the Apostles time being hereby secured, for which *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* stand, and with this consisteth all that *Jerom*, and *Epiphanius* say of the different settlement of *Churches* at first; to all this I repone these few things. 1. Is is most false that the Apostles managed *Church Government* by themselves while they lived; the contrary I have proved, as to Ordination, and Excommunication in *Corinth*, and *Thessalonica*, that these were in the Hands of ordinary Officers

Officers, tho ſuperintended by the Apoſtles. 2. That they ſetled *Biſhops* any where, either in their own time, or left order for it to be done after their deceaſe, is alſo falſe. The incontroullable evidence of it that the *Dr.* talketh of is aſſerted *dure ore*; for he knoweth it is controulled beyond what he or any man can refute, to wit, that *Tim.* and *Tit.* were no *Dioceſan Biſhops* is proved by our Writers; and all the Arguments that are brought for their being ſuch, fully anſwered. This confidence without Argument is unbecoming ſo learned a Man, he hinteth an Argument for his Aſſertion, to wit, that *the care of Government was a diſtinct thing from the Office of an Evangeliſt.* This we deny, the Office of an *Evangeliſt* was to Teach, or Govern by a deputation from the Apoſtles; he ſaith, *Their removes do not invalidate this, becauſe while the Apoſtles lived there were no fixed Biſhops, or but few*: I wiſh he had inſtanced in one, He confeſſeth by this *Tim.* and *Tit.* were not ſuch, and for unfixed *Biſhops*, we read of none ſuch either in Scripture, or *Antiquity*, 3. Neither can this reconcile the Teſtimonies of Antiquity as he would have it; for it doth not anſwer what *Jerom*, *Auguſtine*, *Chriſoſtom*, and others ſay of the Divine inſtitution of parity; neither is it true that *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian* are for *Dioceſan Biſhops.*

Sect. 14. The *Dr.* proceedeth now, *Sect.* 14. to the third thing that he had undertaken to prove, p. 244, to wit, that *the reſtraint of Diſcipline in our Parochial Churchs doth not overthrow their Conſtitution.* In this I ſhall not oppoſe him, and therefore I ſhall only conſider this matter as a grievance, and conſider what he ſaith in Juſtification of it, and not as a ground of *Separation*, and ſhall paſs over what he ſaith, that is of that tendency. *He ſaith Presbyters have power in admiſſion to the Lords Supper, becauſe none are to be admitted, but ſuch as are confirmed, or be ready and deſirous to be confirmed, and Presbyters are judges in that, becauſe they are to ſend a liſt of the Names of the perſons to be Confirmed to the Biſhop, who is to confirm them; and this,* he ſaith, *would (if rightly obſerved) keep as much purity in that Ordinance as is pretended to in the ſeparate Congregations. Anſ.* This is a poor fence for the Table of the Lord, for if one be ready to be confirmed, the *Presbyter* cannot keep him back, tho' he was not liſted by the *Presbyter*, nor Confirmed by the *Biſhop*; and we know many of the worſt of men are ready for it: Again, when one is Confirmed by the *Presbyters* conſent, if he prove never ſo profane or careleſs, the *Presbyter* cannot debar him; the *Biſhops* Confirmation admiteth him, let him do what he will. I

hope *Separate* Meetings will not admit every one to the Lords Table that is a *Church Member*, when they fall into groſs Sins. 2. It is no good way of defending the *Presbyters* Power in manageing of Chriſts Ordinances, to ſay that his Teſtimonie is to be taken about admitting perſons to an Ordinance that Chriſt never inſtituted; to wit, *Confirmation*. 3. This is no great evidence of *Church* Authority in the *Presbyter* that his Teſtimony is taken by the *Biſhop* in order to Admiſſion; it is the *Biſhop* not the *Presbyter* that Authoritatively admitteth. 4. It is an odd way of Admiſſion to Gods Ordinances, not precedented in Scripture, nor purer Antiquity, that one man ſhould judge of the fitneſs of a perſon to be admitted, and another ſhould admitt him; the *Biſhop* muſt act implicitly, and the *Presbyter* is only his informer, where this way of Diſcipline had its uſe we know; the *Dr.* hath yet ſaid nothing to vindicate the power that Chriſt gave to his Miniſters, or to juſtifie the Diſcipline of the *Church of* England.

Sect. 15. Next, *Sect.* 15. He ſpeaketh of the *Presbyters* power in rejecting theſe for ſcandal that have been *Church Members*, and ſheweth out of the *Rubrick* before the Communion, that *the Parochial Miniſters may advertiſe a ſcandalous ſinner not to come to the Lords Table till he repent and amend, and if he continue obſtinate, he may repel him from the Communion, yet ſo as within fourteen days he give account to the Ordinary. Anſ.* This is far from amounting to the power that Chriſt gave to his Miniſters, for 1. By what Law of Chriſt is the *Presbyter* accountable to the *Biſhop*, more then the *Biſhop* is accountable to him? Chriſt made them equal. 2. I ſee no reaſon why a *Presbyter* by himſelf ſhould have power to debar any, it ſhould be done by *Presbyters* in Common; the New Teſtament knoweth no ſuch thing as Excommunication, either greater or leſſer by a ſingle perſon, except it were by an Apoſtle. But our *Biſhops* think they have ſuch a plenitude of power, that they may delegate as much of it as they pleaſe to any other perſon. 3. I ſee the *Dr.* is at a ſtand, what ſort of cenſure this Act of the Parochial Miniſters is, it is not the greater Excommunication; and he confeſſeth p. 277. that it is not the leſſer Excommunication uſed in this *Church*. I deny it not to be a *Church cenſure*, but it is not ſuch as argueth that Power of Diſcipline in the inflicter of it, that Chriſt hath given to all his Miniſters, to be exerciſed by them in Common. The *Dr.* infereth p. 278. from the power of the *Presbyter*, that *our Church doth not deprive them of all the neceſſary and*

Eſſential

Eſſential parts of Church Diſcipline. But if it deprive them of any ſuch part in which they may not medle, it taketh away that power that Chriſt hath given them; it is a fine Apology for *Epiſcopal Uſurpation*, that they ſuffer a *Presbyter* as their delegate, and as he will be accountable to them to do ſome Acts that they themſelves cannot attend; whereas Chriſt gave no more power to a *Biſhop*, than to any of the *Presbyters*.

Sect. 16. Mr. B. objecteth to the Dr. that it is Actionable by Law, if a Pariſh Miniſter admoniſh a perſon by name, not cenſured by the ordinary; to which the Dr. hath two ſorry anſwers. 1. *What need publick Admonition by name? Doth the nature of Church Diſcipline lie in that? It is enough it be done privately*, and ſheweth that *Auguſtine bid people examine themſelves, and abſtain if they ſaw cauſe; and the ſame* Auguſtine *ſaith, that Church Diſcipline may be forborn in ſome caſes in a true Church.* To this I reply, 1. How will the Dr. reconcile this with what he citeth out of the *Rubrick*; will private dealing with the offender amount to repelling of him from the Communion? 2. Diſcipline is a publick and Authoritative Act; and another thing then, private dealing with a perſon, the Apoſtle calleth it a *rebuking before all*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. And it differeth from Preaching, in that by Diſcipline reproofs are applyed to the perſon, in Preaching they are in more general Terms: Now how this ſhould be without publick nameing the Man, I know not. 3. Who doubteth that *Auguſtine* did well in what the Dr. alledgeth; it muſt be our practice when Diſcipline is moſt ſtrictly exerciſed, becauſe Diſcipline cannot reach the ſecret ſins of Men: But *Auguſtine* never thought that therefore Diſcipline was not to be publickly, and perſonally inflicted on Offenders; and ſure Diſcipline may in ſome caſes be forborn, *hic & nunc*, without fault, and where it is faultily forborn, it doth nullifie the being of a *Church*; yet it muſt not always be forborn. His 2. anſwer is, *If a reſtraint be laid on Miniſters by Law, whether the Miniſter ought to admoniſh publickly, and debar in that Caſe?* Reply; why doth the Dr. make the *Rubrick*, and the Law thus to claſh, eſpecially ſeeing the *Common Prayers* and its *Rubrick* are ſetled by Law? And he doth by this fairly yield, that by the conſtitution of the *Church* of *England* now Eſtabliſhed by Law, a Pariſh Miniſter hath no power to keep back any from the Lords Table that hath a mind to come. Why then hath he taken ſo much pains to prove they can do ſomething, and at laſt conclude that this ſame thing is juſt nothing, *parturiunt montes.*

Sect. 17. He frameth an objection to himself, *Sect.* 16. that *the neglects, and abuse of Discipline among us, are too great to be justified, and too notorious to be concealed.* To this he hath several Answers. The 1. is, *That the question is, whether this destroyeth the being of Parochial Churches*; this I pass, for I think it doth not. The 2. is, *It is easier to complain of this, or separate, then find out a way to remedy it.* We propose the Scripture remedy; to wit, to put it into the hands of the Pastors of the *Church* in *Common*. The 3. is, That *there is not that necessity of Church Discipline, as in the primitive times, the Christian Magistrate taking care to punish scandalous offenders, and so to vindicate the honour of the Church*: And to confirm this, he citeth a passage of *King* Charles *the First* to the same purpose. Thus the Drs. zeal for *Episcopacy* is swallowed up in the Gulf of *Erastianism*; to what purpose doth he cite *Cyprians Tu es petrus*, and why hath he pleaded so much for *Episcopacy*, even out of these Fathers that lived under Christian Emperors, as *Augustine*, *Theodoret*, &c. if Church Discipline be at the Magistrates disposal. But I see Men will say any thing δουλεύειν τῇ ὑπόθεσει; let the Dr. answer what our Divines have written against *Erastus*, and his followers, proving that the Church and Republick, are distinct Societies, tho made up of the same Persons; that Christ hath a visible Mediatory Kingdom in the World; that the Rules, Laws, Punishments, and immediate ends of *Church-State* are different. Let him no more tell us of the *Church of* England, but of the *Civil Laws of* England, as that which the Ordinances of Christ are to be dispensed, and ordered by. I shall not digress to refute this Assertion; but Men will be apt to think that this principle doth foully reflect upon Christ, and his Apostles, who gave all their directions about *Chruch* Affairs, to *Church-men*, and not to the *Magistrate*.

Sict. 18. His Fourth Answer, is, that *Excommunication by Protestant Divines, is not left to a Parochial Church*; I do not plead for that; but against putting it into the Hand of one Man. Neither will it hence follow, *a Parish Minister and his Elders may exercise no Discipline*: The Protestant Divines abroad are not of that mind. It is false, That *among us a Minister* (I mean with his Elders) *can only admonish, not repel from the Lords Supper. Why*, (saith he) *may not our Ministers be obliged to certifie the Bishop, as well as theirs to certifie the Presbytery. Ans.* Because Christ gave no power to a *Bishop* above other *Presbyters*; and Discipline in the Apostolick and Primitive

mitive Church, was exerciſed by a ſingle perſon. If the Dr's principle be true; I think it is fitter to certifie the *Juſtice of Peace*, than either of both. What he ſaith of the *African Churches*, is anſwered above. Let him prove that a *Biſhop* by himſelf exerciſed diſcipline in them. The *Biſhop* is often named as the Speaker in the Presbytery, by the declining of him, is meant declining of them. The Inconveniences that he allegeth, by putting *Excommunication* into the Hands of a ſingle Congregation; we ſhun by a prudent reſerving of that dreadful Ordinance, to a meeting of Paſtors. But if it were done by the meaneſt Congregational Elder-ſhip, it could hardly be ſo ill managed, and made ſo ridiculous and contemptible, as it is now in the Hands of *Biſhops*, or rather their Servants, in *England*. It is well known how ſolemn, and terrible it is, as practiced (which is ſeldom) in *Presbyterian Churches*; and how it hath tamed ſome ſtout-hearted Sinners, without a *Capias* or Magiſtratical power to back it. I wonder why the Dr. ſhould uſe ſuch Arguments, as he doth againſt Parochial Diſcipline; to wit, That *there are no certain Rules to proceed by; no Determination what faults deſerve Excommunication; no method of Tryal; no ſecurity againſt falſe Witneſſes; no limitation of Cauſes; no liberty of Appeals, beſides multitudes of other Inconveniences.* Sure this Author thinketh the Bible of little uſe to the *Church*, without a *Book of Canons*; ſuch reflections on the Word of God, are very unbecoming; a part of which is written on purpoſe to teach Miniſters, how to behave themſelves in the Houſe of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. I hope the Dr's more ſober thoughts will ſatisfie him in all theſe; and therefore I ſhall give no more particular Anſwer. But he might have conſidered, if the *Biſhop* have directions for all theſe in the Bible, (and if he have not, his Will muſt be his Law) why may not the *Claſſical* and *Congregational Presbytery*, *reſpective* take the help of them. He thinketh a Parochial Court of Judicature (ſo he is pleaſed to ſpeak in the *Epiſcopal* Stile) would prove more Tyranical, than any *Biſhops Court*. It may be ſo, if managed by bad men; but if they keep within the Rules they profeſs to go by, it will ſeem Tyrannical to none but ſtubborn Sinners, whoſe galled Necks cannot bear Chriſt's Yoke. And it could never be ſo grievous to Mens Perſons and Eſtates, as the *Biſhops Courts*; for theſe we medle not with. His fifth Anſwer I ſay nothing againſt.

Sect. 19. He hath yet a further Apology for the want of *Parochial Diſcipline*; even ſuppoſing every one left to their own Conſciences, as to their fitneſs for the Communion; he ſaith, 1. *The*

greateſt

greateſt offenders abſtain of themſelves; and they that come are uſually the moſt devout. 2. *If Debauched Perſons come, it is upon ſome awakening of Conſcience.* Then both which nothing can be ſaid more contrary to common experience. 3. He ſaith, *This doth not defile right Communicants*: That is true; and therefore it is no cauſe of *Separation*; but it is the *Churches* fault, and ſhould be amended. 5. and 6. *Some Presbyterian Churches, and the Church of* Conſtantinople *were for a Time without Diſcipline.* This is no imitable Example.

SECT. V.

The National Conſtitution of the Church of England *debated.*

HAving now examined what the Dr ſaith for *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy*, I proceed to conſider the next ground for *Separation* pleaded by ſome; to wit, the *National Conſtitution* of the *Church of* England. I have above declared, that I look on this as no ground for *Separation*; yea, nor cauſe of complaint, if it be taken *ſano ſenſu.* Though I think every organized Congregation hath a governing power in it ſelf; yet this power is not Independent, but Subordinate to the Aſſociation of ſuch *Churches.* Theſe Aſſociations may be greater or ſmaller; one contained in another, and ſo ſubordinate to it, as the Conveniency of meeting for Diſcipline doth allow; and becauſe the Aſſociation of *Churches* in a whole Nation, containeth all the *Churches* in it, and may all meet in their repreſentatives, for the governing them all in common. This we own as a *National Church*; wherefore on this Head I have no debate with the Dr. except in ſo far as he is, for *National*, and *Provincial Officers* in this *National Church*, *Archbiſhops*, and *Biſhops*, put but Provincial and National Synods in the place of theſe, and I ſhall contend no further. I ſhall not then medle with the ſubſtance of this his Diſcourſe; but only note a few things.

Sect. 2. The Firſt thing that I take notice of, is, p. 289. Where the Dr. maketh the inſtitution of the Apoſtolick Function in the Hands of twelve Men, to be an Argument againſt *Churches* Power of governing themſelves. This proveth nothing; for the ordinary Government of the *Church* muſt be regulated by what the Apoſtles

ſtles appointed, which is an abiding thing; not by their own governing the *Church*, which ceaſed with them. Next, p. 290. he ſaith, the Succeſſion of *Biſhops* from the Apoſtles, is, *Matter of Fact, atteſted by the moſt early, knowing, honeſt, and impartial Witneſſes*; which I deny and have diſproved. The next remark ſhall be upon, p. 291. where he pleadeth for *Biſhops* joining together, and becoming one *National Church* (he ſhuneth mentioning a *Primate* under, and in whom they unite) and this he ſeemeth to vindicate from making way for *Papal Uſurpation*, and an Univerſal Head of the *Chriſtian Church*; by *its being intended for the good of the whole ſo united, and no ways repugnant to the deſign of the Inſtitution, and not uſurping the rights of others, nor aſſuming more than can be managed. This*, he ſaith, *an Univerſal Paſtor muſt do; and he therefore mentioneth this, that any one may ſee that the force of this reaſoning will never juſtifie the Papal Uſurpation.* I cannot, for all this, ſee, that it is more juſtifiable, or conſiſtent with Chriſt's Inſtitution, to unite a *National Church* under a *Primate*, than to unite the Univerſal *Church* under a *Pope*: Save that the one is a further remove from Parity that Chriſt inſtituted, and ſo a greater Evil, than the other; but *magis & minus non variant ſpeciem*, To clear this, I ſhall run over theſe Four qualities that he mentioneth, in their uniting under a *Primate*; and conſider whether they do agree better to him, than to a *Pope*. The Firſt is, *it is intended for the good of the Whole, ſo United.* If we judge by Intentions; no doubt this intention will be pretended to by the *Papiſts* alſo; and is *de facto* as much pleaded by them, and with as ſpecious pretences. And if we conſider the reallity of the thing; ſad experience ſheweth, that neither the one nor the other doth conduce to the good of the whole; but is improved to Tyrannizing over mens Conſciences; and Rending, and Haraſſing the *Church*, for the ſake of ſuperſtitious Concepts of corrupt Men.

Sect. 3. The Second, *This Union is no way repugnant to Inſtitution.* This he ſhould have proved; we deny it: Let him ſhew us more Inſtitution, or warrant for a *Metropolitan*, than for a *Pope*. If we ſhould own *Biſhops* as Succeſſors to the Apoſtles; yet an *Arch-biſhop*, a *Metropolitan*, a *Patriarch*, a *Pope*, muſt ſtill be beſide Inſtitution, except the Dr. will own an Imparity among the Apoſtles, and ſo be for *Peters Supremacy*. The Third is, That *in this Union there is no uſurping the Rights of others.* I ſay, there is, as really as there is in the *Papacy*; for it is the Right of every one of Chriſt's Miniſters, to govern their

the *Church* in equallity of power with the reſt; this is taken from them, and put into the hand of a Biſhop; and that right that the *Biſhop* hath uſurped from the *Presbyters*, the *Primate* uſurpeth from him, and the *Pope* doth no more but uſurp the ſame from all the *Metropolitans*, and *Patriarchs*, that they had uſurped from theſe under them. The 4th. is, *not aſſuming more than can be managed.* Nothing but prejudice could hinder a man of the *Doctors* underſtanding, to ſee, that the *Biſhop* aſſumeth more power than he can manage, as really as the *Primate* or the *Patriarch*; yea, or the *Pope* doth. For as the *Pope* cannot adminiſter the Word and Sacraments, and Diſcipline of the *Church* to all Chriſtians in his own perſon, no more can a *Primate* to a whole Nation, nor a *Biſhop* to a Dioceſs conſiſting of many thouſands of People, and hundreds of Congregations. And as the *Biſhop* can do all this by the *Parochial Clergy*, for Word, and Sacraments, and by his *Chancellors*, *Archdeacons*, &c. for his Diſcipline, ſuch as it is: And as the *Primate* can rule a whole *National Church*, by his and the *Biſhops Courts*: So can the *Pope* rule all Chriſtian people (*ut cunque*) by *Cardinals*, *Patriarchs*, *Metropolitans*, *Biſhops*, by his *Legate*, or other Officers of his appointment. I challenge the Doctor, or any man, to ſhew ſuch a difference between a *National Officer*, and an *Oecumenick Officer* in the *Church*, as maketh one lawful, and the other unlawful. The *Pope*'s uſurping a Plenitude of *Civil Power*, and more groſly abuſing his pretended *Church Power*, will not make this difference. For we ſpeak of a *Pope* and *Primate* as ſuch, abſtracted from all Accidents of ſuch an Officer in the *Church*.

Sect. 4. *Pag.* 292. He ſeems to expoſe the framing of *Church-Government* too much, to the reaſon, or rather fanſie, of Men; when he ſaith, That *Union being the beſt way to preſerve the Church, (the preſervation of which Chriſt deſigneth by his Inſtitution) we may reaſonably infer, that whatever tendeth to promote this union, and to prevent notable inconveniences, is within the deſign of the firſt Inſtitution, tho' it be not contained in expreſs words.* The *Papiſts* are dull if they cannot out of this principle hammer out a *Pope*, as well as the *Doctor* can frame a *Biſhop*, or *Arch-Biſhop*: This Inference as thus looſly ſet down, is no way to be admitted; becauſe Chriſt hath not provided for the unity, and preſervation of his Church, by leaving it to Mens will, or wholly to their reaſon either; but by his own Inſtitutions to be wiſely managed by the Officers, that he hath appointed in his houſe. Unity is then to be preſerved, Diviſions and Hereſies to be prevented by the painful and faithful preaching of the

the Goſpel by Chriſts Miniſters in their ſeveral particular Charges, by private, and publick Inſtructions, and Admonitions: By their joynt Concurrence in cenſuring, and drawing out the Sword of Diſcipline againſt ſtubborn Offenders: Theſe are Chriſts Inſtitutions, and will be effectual when he is pleaſed to bleſs them; and this bleſſing we are to expect on his own appointed means, not on mens Devices: But we deny that Unity in the Church is to be preſerved in any way that men in their Wiſdom think fit, and particularly, that it is to be preſerved by ſetting up *Arch-Biſhops*, and *Biſhops* in the *Church*: Theſe being none of Chriſt's means appointed for that end. It is often ſeen that means thus deviſed of Men, by Croſſing of Chriſt's Inſtitution, either fail of their end, or by mending one evil make a worſe: Peace, and Unity is ſometimes (and in the caſe in hand) procured to the Church, with the bearing down of Piety, and ſhutting out of Purity.

Sect. 5. I diſlike one Particle of that Definition that he giveth of the *National Church of* England *diffuſive*, p. 299. to wit, he ſaith, *It is the whole Body of Chriſtians in this Nation, conſiſting of paſtors, and people, agreeing in that Faith, Government, and Worſhip which are eſtabliſhed by the Laws of this Realm.* Had he put the word of God inſtead of the Laws of this Realm, I ſhould have fully aſſented to this deſcription. But againſt that Particle I have two Exceptions. 1. The *Civil Law* is accidental to the Church, and is neither a conſtituent part of its eſſence, nor a neceſſary adjunct of it: The *Church* hath been without it, and I hope he will not ſay, That if the Laws were taken away, the *Church* is unchurched for that. 2. This maketh the *Church of* England, a variable and mutable thing, as the Laws of men are, for if *Presbytery*, if *Anabaptiſm*, if *Independency*, *Popery*, *Socinianiſm*, and what ſort of Religion you can name, either as to Faith, or Worſhip, or Government, were eſtabliſhed by Law: They that are of that way ſhould then be the *Church of* England; which is not only abſurd, but a dangerous notion in ſuch a critical time as this (I hope the *Doctor* did not deſign a fair retreat by this) if *Popery* (which God forbid) ſhould come to be eſtabliſhed by Law: The *Papiſts* were the *Church of* England, and all the Ties that men are under to the *Church of* England, by their Oaths, and Subſcriptions, ſhould oblige them to be *Papiſts*; and all the *True Sons of the Church* muſt turn with the Law, as the Weather-cock doth with the Wind: This is like to be pleaſing Doctrin to many. But I perceive the *Doctors* deſign by this fine

new notion is, To *let men ſee how eaſily the* Church of *England is diſtinguiſhed from* Papiſts *on the one ſide, and* Diſſenters *on the other*; which makes him *wonder at them who cannot tell what is meant by the* Church of *England*. If Men wondred much before, they may wonder far more now, what is meant by the *Church of* England, when they ſee her painted in ſo changeable colours, as that ſhe may be one thing now, and another next year, and another the third year, and ſo on. The Scripture placeth the Moon under the *Churches* Feet, and the Twelve Stars, Apoſtolick Doctrine, on her Head, as her cognizance and Glory, but the *Doctor* hath advanced the Moon to her Head, that ſhe muſt be known by it; what he will do with the Twelve Stars I know not. He is more favourable to the *Papiſts*, and *Diſſenters*, they are to be known by their Conformity, or Nonconformity to Scripture; not to the Laws of the Land: But if *Papiſts* or *Diſſenters* ſhould happen to get the Law on their ſide, what will that party be that is now the *Church of* England? It ſeems the *Doctor* is fond of this notion, for he hath it up again, *p.* 300. to the queſtion, how comes it to be one *National Church*: He anſwereth, *becauſe it was received by the Common conſent of the whole Nation in Parliament, as other Laws of the Nation are, and is univerſally received by all that obey theſe Laws.* And thus he *cleareth our Miſts about the Church of* England. He had debated much with Mr. *B.* owning a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, but not a *National Church*; but here he homologateth all that Mr. *B.* had ſaid, for the *Parliament* owning the Faith, maketh a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, but it is ſome other thing that maketh a *National Church*, to wit, the Collective Body of all the Congregations of a Nation agreeing in the ſame Faith, and Worſhip, and Government, as it is held forth in the Word of God. If the *Doctor* ſay, this leaveth room for every party to call themſelves the *Church*; for all pretend to have the Word on their ſide. I anſwer, This is not to be denied; for till the Lord cure our Diviſions about truth, and about his Ordinances, we are not like to come to a deciſion of that queſtion, *Who is the Church?* For all Congregations are parts of the *Church*; and theſe that are neareſt to the Scripture rule are the trueſt part of the *Church*: The Apoſtle decided that Controverſie, who is the Circumciſion, (the Dialect of ſome in that time, for *who is the Church*) not by the Laws of men; but by the truth of God that they owned, *Phil.* 3. 3. The *Doctor* hath found out a new *Mark* of the *Church* that *Bellar-*

mine

mine hath not, (though he hath more than enough) to wit, They that have the *Law on their ſide are the Church.*

Sect. 6. He telleth us that the *repreſentative Church of* England *is, the Biſhops and* Presbyters *of this Church meeting together according to the Laws of this Realm to conſult, and adviſe about matters of Religion.* This he ſaith not of the *Convocation at Weſtminſter*; but *of the Conſent of both Convocations.* Here I obſerve, 1. That the *Law of the Land* is ſo conſtitutive of a *Church* to this Author, that without it there is neither *diffuſive*, nor *repreſentative Church.* Then what becometh of the *Apoſtolick Church*, and that of the firſt 300 years, and of the *Greek Churches* under the *Turk*; yea, and of the *Proteſtant Church of* France, where their Prince is not only Chriſtian, but *moſt Chriſtian?* And yet his Law does not favour that Church. 2. I have ſhewed before that the *Convocation* can make no *Church National* repreſentative: The *Presbyters*, and *Churches* of the Nation being ſo inſufficiently repreſented there. 3. Neither do I underſtand how the Conſent of two Convocations, that never meet perſonally together, can be called a *Church*, or *National repreſentative Church*: I thought a *Church* had been a Meeting, not a conſent of men: A Perſonal Concurrence in ſome Religious Acts; not a mental conſent about them: Bodies are requiſite to make a Church, as well as Souls.

Sect. 7. I plead not for Mr. *B*'s Conſtitutive Regent part of the *Catholick Church*; though an *Oecumenick Counſel*, if it could be had, might better challenge that Name than the *Pope*; and I think Chriſts Headſhip over the *Catholick Church* doth not anſwer to what is debated about, to wit, a viſible power, ſuper-intending all the Inferiour *Church powers* on earth. We own a Catholick, diffuſive, viſible *Church*; but wiſh, rather than hope for one repreſentative; for we are perſwaded, the *Pope* hath no title to ſuch a *headſhip*. But the queſtion between him and Mr. *B.* being about a viſible repreſentative or regent Head of the *National Church of* England: I have ſhewed that conſent cannot ſtand in this room; and therefore bringeth in the *Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, and Presbyters* ſummoned by the *Kings Writ*, whoſe Concluſions muſt be enacted by a *Parliament*. Againſt this National Head I object, 1. That it hath no Warrant to repreſent the *Churches* of the Nation; of which before. 2. He ſeemeth above to make two ſuch Convocations, and ſo there muſt either be two *Churches of* England, or the one *Church of* England muſt be *Biceps*, and ſo a Monſter. 3. This conſent or Convocation

(call it what you will) is not a regent head of the *Church of* England, it medleth only with makeing rules for Government (which is none of the Churches work, ſhe is only miniſterially to execute Chriſts Laws) but doth not govern; by receiving Appeals, cenſuring the Maleverſation of inferior ruling Churches, inflicting Cenſures, *&c.*

Sect. 8. Mr. *B.* asketh whether the rules that unite the *Church of* England, be Divine, or Humane. The Dr. anſwereth, *Sect.* 22. *The Church is founded on a Divine Rule; but requireth a conformity to the rules that ſhe hath appointed, as agreeable to the Word of God.* This, I conceive is not to anſwer the queſtion; he ſhould have told us in which of the two rules their unity lieth: We know that all *Churches* as well as theſe of *New-England*, (which he mentioneth) if the Magiſtrate own them, have civil Priviledges annexed to *Church* Orders, but that is ſtill wide from the queſtion, whether theſe Orders be Divine, or Humane. Doth the *Church*, or do the *Churches of* New-England *make Orders for obſerving Ceremonies* in God's Worſhip, deviſed by Man, and place their unity in that? It remaineth then ſtill, that if the National Unity of the *Church of* England, be made by Divine Rules that either are expreſly, or by Conſequence in Scripture we are members of it, and will in all theſe joyn with it; but if they place their unity in obſerving rules that have no Warrant from Scripture; if we cannot joyn with them in ſo doing, we do not *ſeparate* from them, but they in ſo far *ſeparate* from us, and from all the pure *Churches* of Chriſt.

Sect. 9. He maintaineth, *p.* 305. againſt one of his Opponents, who had objected, That the Church had no power to make Laws about *Fœderal Rules, teaching Signs, and Symbols*, &c. That *ſuch a Church hath power to appoint Rules of Order, and Decency not repugnant to the Word of God, and that all ſetled Churches are for this*, I reply. 1. He doth not anſwer to the Objection: I hope all Rules for Order, and Decency are not about *Fœderal Rites*, and *teaching Symbols*: Ordering the natural Circumſtances of Worſhip comprehendeth the one, but not the other. 2. It is falſe. that all ſetled Churches appoint Rules for ſuch Order, and Decency as conſiſteth in *Religious Ceremonies, teaching Symbols*, and ſuch like. 3. It is alſo falſe that all ſetled *Churches* appoint Rules of Order, and Decency even in the Circumſtantials of Religion; ſo as to exclude all from their Priviledges, and to incite the Magiſtrate to puniſh them, who do not conform to theſe Rules (as he alledgeth) other Churches uſe to rule

by

by holding forth light, and Perſwaſives, not to impoſe with rigour and force on the Conſciences of men: Nor do they concern the Magiſtrate, but where ſome notable violations of the Law of God, otherwiſe not to be reſtrained, doth require it. 4. It is a falſe ſuppoſition, that our Impoſed Rules about Ceremones, are not repugnant to the Word of God; but this is not the place of that Debate.

SECT. VI.

The Peoples Right of Electing their Paſtors.

THe laſt of theſe four Pleas, that the Reverend Author ranketh under the firſt Head, and which he alledgeth, ſome make uſe of for *ſeparation*, is, That the people are deprived of their right in the choice of their own Paſtors: This he proceedeth to *Sect.* 24. I do not make the depriving the people of this power a cauſe of *ſeparation*; though I reckon it a notable Grievance, and earneſtly deſire a redreſs of it, and pray that the Lord may move the Hearts of Rulers to defend the people in this their Right, againſt them that take it from them. But our work is now to defend this Right of the Members of the *Church*, againſt the Doctor's Aſſaults. But before I come to this, I ſhall ſhew 1. What this Right is that they have in Electing their Paſtors. 2. From whom they Derive it. 3. What ground we have to think that they have ſuch a Right.

Sect. 2. To ſhew what this Right is, I aſſert, 1. That the people have no Right to beſtow the Benefice on their Paſtor, nor to elect him to it, unleſs either it be their own gift, or the giver of it hath transferred that power on them. It is *Election* to the Office, not to the Benefice, that we debate about; which if the Doctor had conſidered, he might have ſpared a great deal of his following Diſcourſe. It is true, the Magiſtrate ought to provide for the *Church*, ſo as the perſon, regularly choſen, may enjoy the Benefice; but if the Magiſtrate pleaſe to reſerve it to his own diſpoſing, there is no Remedy; the people muſt either chuſe the man that may have the maintenance, if he be tollerably qualified, or they muſt provide

vide for him themſelves. And ſo when a Patron giveth a Maintenance on theſe terms, That he have the chuſing of the perſon who ſhall enjoy it, the *Church* ſhould either reject it, and provide for their Miniſter another way, or chuſe the perſon that the Patron preſenteth. But this Patronage is a ſad Grievance to the *Church, deviſed in* Satan's *Kitchen*, ſaith Beza, *confeſſ. fid.* c. 35. it is an oppreſſing of people in their Spiritual Rights, and in that which concerneth their Souls: A greater bondage than if the whole Pariſh were obliged to eat nothing but what the Patron pleaſeth. And it had been leſs blame-worthy, if theſe Donors of *Church Livings* had kept their Gift to themſelves, than thus to prelimit the people in that which ſo nearly concerns their Souls; and to make that but an Acceſſory (to wit, the charge of Souls) which ſhould be the thing principally minded: As now the Living is. 2. The Magiſtrate, or Patrons electing of a Miniſter, may give him a Title to the Living; but it can never make him the Paſtor of ſuch a people, nor fix a Relation between him, and them, of Paſtor, and Flock: For it is wholly Forreign to the *Church* as a *Church*; it is a thing of Worldly concern, and therefore can never found that Relation, which is an Inſtitution of Chriſt in his *Church*. 3. We do not deny, but when the people have choſen a Paſtor, and the *Presbytery* hath ordained him alſo, the Magiſtrate may Impriſon, Baniſh, or otherwiſe puniſh him, ſo as he is conſequentially reſtrained from the exerciſe of his Miniſtry among that people; if the man be guilty of a civil crime (of which the Magiſtrate is Judge) but we deny that this Act doth diſſolve the miniſterial relation between that Paſtor, and People; that cannot be done but by the *Church* 4. We do not ſo put *Election* into the hand of the multitude, as either to exclude the *Elderſhip* that is among them; or to exempt the people from their guidance in this: The *Elderſhip* ought to regulate this Action; yet ſo, as it be not done without the conſent of the generality. 5. We are far from ſaying, That the People by their *Election*, doth make the *Elected* perſon a Miniſter; that is done by *Ordination*, which is in the Hands of the *Presbytery*. 6. We do not ſay, That this *Elective power* of the people is Arbitrary, and independent; they are to be bounded in it by the Rules of the Goſpel, that ſet forth the qualifications of Miniſters; and if they chuſe contrary to theſe, the *Presbytery* may reject the perſon, and refuſe to ordain him. 7. We deny not but a part of a *Church*, or the whole *Church*, may forfeit this Right, as to the preſent exerciſe of it, by

Igno-

Ignorance, Scandal, Irreconcileable Contentions about the matter, and such like; in which case the power of *Election* devolveth into the hands of the Pastors of the *Churches* associated; I mean the *Presbytery*. Yet, the peoples satisfaction should be endeavoured as much as is possible. 8. It is the Right of the people, which they ought not to be deprived of, nor restrained from exercising, ordinarily, nor without singularly weighty cause, to chuse their own Pastors, and other *Church Officers*.

Sect. 3. As to the Author of this Right in the people, I maintain, that it is neither from the *Churches* Determination, nor from any grant from the *Magistrate*; neither do I plead any Law of nature for it: For by Divine Institution (which is never contrary to the Law of Nature) it was otherwise in the *Jewish Church*. And though there be abundant reason for it, it being the priviledge of Free Corporations, and other Societies, to chuse these that are to govern them; and it being rational, that a Corporation, or person, may chuse the Lawyer that they will intrust their Estates to; and the Physician in whose hand they put their life; so men should not be imposed upon to entrust the Conduct of their Souls to a person that they have not confidence in, and whom they cannot chuse for that end. Yet, I say, we do not lay the stress of the matter on *Humane Reason*, but on *Gospel Institution*: I affirm then, that this is the Institution of Christ; that it is the order that he hath appointed in the Gospel, that people should have liberty to chuse their own Pastors, and other *Church* Officers.

Sect. 4. I am next to shew the grounds that we have to think so. I shall prove this by shewing that it was the constant practice in the *Church*, while the Apostles managed the Affairs of it, that *Church* Officers were chosen by the suffrages of the people; and I hope it will not be denied, that such practice is declarative of Christ's Institution. The first Argument for it, is from *Act.* 14. 23. where though *Ordination*, or appointing, be expressed in our Translation, yet the Greek Word χειροτονήσαντες signifieth a chusing by Suffrages; as the manner of the *Grecians* was, by stretching out or lifting up the hand (for that is the force of the Word) to declare their Votes. I deny not that this Word is sometimes used figuratively, for potestative mission, the effect, or consequent of *Election*; and that by one person, without Suffrages, as *Act.* 10. 41. yet it is very rare that the Word is so used: And it is evident, that the Word is most commonly used in this sence; of all the Instances that *Scapula*,

in

in his *Lexicon*, giveth of the uſe of this Word, not one of them is to the contrary. And it cannot be Inſtanced, that ever this word is uſed for laying on of hands; lifting up (which is the force of the Word) and laying them down, being ſo oppoſite, it is not to be imagined that the one ſhould be put for the other. Neither is it fit to ſeek for the Figurative ſignification of the Word, when the proper ſignification may be admitted. It is objected againſt this uſe of the Word here, that they ordained αὐτοῖς not *ἐαυτοῖς to them*, not *to themſelves*, that is, the Apoſtles to the people ordained Elders. *Anſw.* It cannot be denied, but αὐτοῖς is uſed indifferently for *them*, or *themſelves*; and why it may not here be underſtood of themſelves, I ſee not; ſo as that here is denoted the Action of appointing Elders for the people, in which the people had a hand by *Election*, as the Word here importeth, and the Apoſtles had a hand by *Ordination*, as can be proved by other Scriptures? But if we ſhould turn αὐτοῖς *them*, the ſenſe may run plainly thus; the Apoſtles appointed by *Ordination*, Elders for the people, upon their *Electing* them by Suffrages. It is no ſtrange thing in Scripture to ſee divers Actions expreſſed by the ſame Word, where one is the conſequent of the other, as *Iſ.* 38. 17. *Thou haſt Loved my Soul out of the pit of corruption*, i. e. delivered it, becauſe thou loved it: Alſo *Act.* 7. 9. The Patriarchs are ſaid to ſell *Joſeph* to *Egypt*; where both their Actions, and the Actions of the *Midianites* who carried him to *Egypt*, and there ſold him, are included in one Word. Many Inſtances of this kind of Syntheſis may be ſeen in *Gluſſ. Philol. Sacr. lib.* 3. *tract.* 3. p. 229.---It is alſo objected, that theſe are ſaid to *Ordain* who commmended the people to the Lord; that is, the Apoſtles, and that the Apoſtles are ſpoken of all along in the Nominative Caſe, and not the people; and therefore they muſt be the Actors meant by this word. *Anſw.* We deny not the Apoſtles to be Actors meant in this Word, as the Patriarchs were in the Word, *Selling to Egypt*, Act. 7. 9. but we ſay the peoples action is alſo included, in the force of the Word; to wit, their Voteing by lifting up their hands; which in no reaſon can be applied to the Apoſtles, being but two men, the matter needed not ſuch a way of Voteing between them. I conclude, this being done κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every* Church, the people *reſpective* chuſing their Paſtors, and the Apoſtles *Ordaining* them, it is clear to have been generally the practice of theſe times, and ſo the Inſtitution of Chriſt.

Sect. 5.

Sect. 5. Argument 2. The Apoſtles were ſo careful; yea, rather the Lord was ſo careful, to preſerve this right in *Election* of ordinary Officers; that when Men for extraordinary Work were to be ſent forth, the Peoples choice was not neglected. Hence two were choſen by the Multitude, and preſented to the Lord; that by Lot the Lord might chuſe one of them to be an Apoſtle Succeſſor to *Judas*, *Act.* 1. 23. and *Matthias* being choſen by *Lot*, it is ſaid of him, *ver.* 26, συνκατεψηφίσθη he was reckoned by Votes, among the Apoſtles, and *Act.* 13. 1, 2. the Lord chuſed *Barnabus*, and *Paul* for a ſpecial Service; but he would have the Votes of the *Church* for it. If the Lord thus condeſcended to take the preſent conſent in ſuch a matter; is it fit for *Biſhops* or Patrons to neglect them, and obtrude Men upon them, whether they will or not? Argument 3*d.* Whenever any extraordinary piece of work (I mean ſuch as was not daily exerciſe) was to be put into the Hands of Miniſters, without a ſpecial Revelation; they were choſen to it by the Suffrages of the People, as appeareth by *Act.* 15. 22. where *Judas*, and *Silas* are ſent to *Antioch*, about carrying the Decrees of the *Synod* at *Jeruſalem*, and backing them with their Doctrine. So 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. 23. Some are choſen by the *Churches* to accompany *Paul* in carrying a Collection to the *Jews* in *Judea*; and are called the *Meſſengers of the Churches.* Argument 4*th.* The *Deacons* were appointed to be choſen by the People, ἐξετε, alſo the other *Church* Officers ſee, *Act.* 6. 2, 3. It is a frivolous Anſwer; that it doth not follow, that they ſhould chuſe their Paſtors, becauſe they may chuſe the Diſtributers of their Benevolence. For, 1. both are *Church* Officers, inſtituted by Chriſt: In this then they are alike. 2. It were a leſs matter, that people were impoſed on in this leſſer concern; than in that of greater conſequence; and if the Lord have taken care, that they ſhould be ſatisfied about the one, much more that they ſhould be ſatisfied about the other.

Sect. 6. Our 5*th.* Argument, is from the concurrent Teſtimony of the purer primitive times; which we the rather uſe, becauſe our Brethren lay ſo much weight on this for the Power of *Biſhops*, it ſhould not be neglected by them in the matter of *Election*; and that of other *Church Officers.* Alſo, becauſe nothing of *Church-Order* is more clearly, and frequently, and unanimouſly in the Writings of the Ancients; nor did longer continue untaken away, even in the degenerate Ages of the *Church*; ſo that we may reckon *Patronages*, and obtruding Miniſters on the People, among the Novelties

velties of *Popery*. I ſhall in the firſt place bring ſome *Canons* of *Council* for this : *Theodoret* mentioneth an Epiſtle from the Famous *Council of Nice*, to a *Church* in *Egypt*; in which are theſe words, *Dignum eſt vos poteſtatem habere & eligendi quem libet & eorum nomine dandi quem clero Sr. Digni*. And after, *ſi quum vero contigerit requieſcere in Eccleſia, tunc pro vehim honorem defuncti eos quem nuper Aſſumpti St. ſolummodi ſi videantur digni, & populus eos Elegerit*. The *Synod Conſtantinopolit.* in an Ep. to *Damaſus*, and others, ſhew that they had ordained *Nectarius*---- *cuncta decernente pariter civctate*, and that they had ordained *Flavianus*, *omni Eccleſia parriter decernente*. Hiſt. inpert. lib. 9. c. 14. Alſo, 4. *Carthagin. can.* 1. It is required that a *Biſhop* be *Ordained*, *cum omni conſenſu Clericorum, & Laicorum, & Concil.* 3. *Carthag. can.* 22. *Nullus ordinetur Clericus ſine Epiſcopi examinatione & populi Teſtimonio*. Alſo the Tenth *Canon of Council. Cabilonens*; (which was in the midle of the Seventh Century) hath theſe words, as they are in *Caranz. Summa Concil. Signis Epiſcopus de quacunque Civitate fuerit defunctus, non ab aliis niſi a com. provincialibus, clero, & civibus ſuis, alterius habeatur electio ſin autem aliter fiet, ejus Ordinatio irrita habeatur*. Here the want of Popular *Election* is held to make void *Ordination*.

Sect. 7. Another ſort of Teſtimonies out of Antiquity, are the Decrees of *Popes*; it was of old the *Canon Law*, that the People ſhould have a Hand in *Election* of Miniſters, *Biſhops*, and others. *Anacletus*, who lived very near the Apoſtles time, hath theſe words in one of his Epiſtles, *cum ejectionem ſummorum ſacerdotum ſibi Dominus reſervaverit, eorum electionem tamen bonis ſacerdotibus & ſpiritualibus populis conceſſit*; *Cæleſtinus primus*; who lived in the beginning of the Fifth Century, hath theſe words, *nullus invitis detur Epiſcopus cleri plebis, & ordinis conſenſus requiratur*. *Galaſius* about the 500 year decreed, *Electionem Epiſcopi eſſe totius Eccleſiæ*. Alſo, *Stephanus, Pecretat. diſt.* 63. ſaith, *Electionem non ſolum ad ſpirituales, ſed etiam ad Paicos pertinere*. And *Leo Magnus*, *Anno* 440. *diſt.* 63. is plain, and full to this purpoſe. So *Gregorius Magnus*, about 590. frequently writeth to this purpoſe. I inſtance only his Letter to *Scholaſticus*; *Hortanum Magnitudinem veſtram, ut convocantes priores vel plebem civitatis, de electione alterius Sacerdotis cogites*, and when in caſe they found not one, he deſireth they may ſend three to *Rome*, to conſult about it, adding *quorum & judicio plebs tota conſentiat*. *Hadrianus*, who lived near the end of the Eighth Century, in an Ep. to *Charlemain*, commendeth *Canones Olitanos*, and ſaith, *at electiones*

he

he cauſed to proclaim the *conſuetudo Olitana*; to wit, *Plebs & clerus Eccleſiæ illius ſimul conſiſtens, elegerunt ſibi Epiſcopum.*

Sect. 8. Alſo particular Fathers have frequently given their Vote for this priviledge of the People. *Cyprian Ep.* 3. often mentioneth his being choſen by the Suffrage of the whole *Church* of *Carthage*, and in his *Ep. de Martial. & Baſilid*; he ſaith, *Plebs in ſua poteſtate habet eligendi dignos ſacerdotes.* And he ſaith, *Idem videmus de divina Authoritate deſcendere.* And he excuſeth himſelf very carefully, that in a caſe of neceſſity, he had choſen *Aurelius* to be a Reader in the *Church*, without the Knowledge, and Conſent of the People. *Tertul. apol. cap.* 39. ſaith of the *Seniores* that preſide in their Aſſemblies, that is, the Miniſters, *Approbantur Suffragiis eorum quos regere debent. Greg. Nazianzen*; in a Funeral Sermon made on his Fathers Death; diſcourſeth much of this priviledge of the People. *Chryſoſtom. lib.* 4. *de Sacerdotio*, is of the ſame mind. Alſo, *Auguſtine* naming *Eracius*, his Succeſſor addeth this expreſs caution, *ſi Eccleſia Conſentiat*, and declareth, *hoc eſſe receptum provatumque jus & conſuetudine, ut tota Eccleſia ſibi elegat Epiſcopum, aut in ipſum conſentiat. Hierom Ep. ad ruſtic. Monachum, Foll.* (292.) *cum ad perfectam ætatem veneris ſi tamen vita comes fuerit, & te vel populus vel pontifex Civitate Elegerint agito quæ Clerici St.* He ſuppoſeth it as the received practice; that the People ſhould elect. *Ambros. Ep.* 82. *Electio & vocatio quæ ſit a tota Eccleſia, vere & certo eſt divina vocatio ad munus Epiſcopi*: Many more Citations might be added; but theſe may ſuffice, and abundance more may be ſeen *append. ad Catalog. Teſt. veritat.* where this right of the People is deduced from the Days of the Apoſtles, to the Eigth Century, by Teſtimonies out of all ſorts of Authors. That Author taketh notice of this, as an ordinary Clauſe in many of the Epiſtles, which *Tinemeras, Archbiſhop of* Rhemes, in the Reign of *Charlemain ab omnibus debet eligi, cui debet ab omnibus obediri.*

Sect. 9. I ſhall now attend to what the Learned Dr. hath to ſay in the contrary of this right of the People, ſo divinely appointed, ſo anciently, univerſally, and long approved. He diſcourſeth theſe three things to this purpoſe, 1. *What inherent Power the People had.* 2. *How they came to be deveſted of it.* 3. *Whether there be ſufficient Ground to reſume it.* One would think, that if this Power be from Chriſt; his other two parts of his diſcourſe might have been ſpared: For who then could take it from them? And they always had a Right to reſume it, being unjuſtly deprived of it. As to the firſt

of theſe, his debate with Dr. *O.* about the Peoples *Church-Power*, and the Government of the *Church* being *Democrical*, I medle not with; we plead for this power in them, not all *Church-power*. But he cometh, *Sect.* 25. to this power of *Election*; for diſproving of which, he undertaketh to make out ſix things: I ſhall examine them in order. But I think it had been more to the purpoſe to have anſwered the Scriptures, and Teſtimonies out of Antiquity alledged by the oppoſites, which he hath not done. The Firſt of theſe is, *That the main ground of the Peoples Intereſt was founded on the Apoſtles Canon; that a Biſhop muſt be blameleſs, and of good report*, 1 Tim. 3. 2, 7. *Anſ.* I have produced other grounds, and not made this either the main, or any ground of this Right of the People; for indeed that paſſage of Scripture doth direct the *Electors*; but doth not determine who ſhould *Elect*. I deny not but ſome of the Ancients made uſe of that Scripture to this purpoſe, but they made uſe of others alſo; and having eſtabliſhed the Truth on other Grounds, they might well apply this place as ſpoken to the People, to direct them how to manage that power of *Election*, that the Lord had given them. This is a ſorry Shift to ſhun the Dint of Arguments, to pitch on that which is either no Argument, or a weak one, and to ſet up that as the only Argument; and ſo by beating it down, to Triumph.

Sect. 10. He bringeth a paſſage out of *Clem.* on which he taketh a great deal of pains, to make it ſpeak for him contrary to the manifeſt deſign of it. The paſſage is, *The Apoſtles, Preaching through Cities, and Countries, did appoint the firſt Fruites; having made a Spiritual Tryal of them, to be Biſhops, and Deacons.---- The Apoſtles foreſaw the Contentions that would be about the Name of Epiſcopacy* (i. e. ſaith the Dr. *about the choice of Biſhops*) *therefore they appointed the Perſons mentioned, and left the Diſtribution of their Office with this Inſtruction; that as ſome dyed, other approved Men ſhould be choſen into their Office: Theſe therefore who were appointed by them, or other eminent Men; the Church being therewith all pleaſed, diſcharging their Office with Humility---- cannot be juſtly put out of their Office.* A Man of leſs learning than the Dr. might eaſily draw the quite contrary Concluſion, from theſe words of *Clement*; but it will require all his Skill, and more too; to conclude from them againſt popular *Election*. But thus he argueth; *They were to be appointed by the Apoſtles; therefore not of the Peoples choice.* Anſ. *Non ſequitur*: The Deacons were appointed by the Apoſtles, *Act* 6. 3. yet the Peo-

ple

ple are *to look out from among them, i. e.* to chuſe; and the Apoſtles to appoint them, *i. e.* ſet them apart for their work. Many other Inſtances may be given; yet this Argumentation the Dr. uſeth again, pag. 315. as if it were a mighty Argument. He ſaith, *it ſeems ſome of the People were Contentious, and endeavoured to throw out ſome of their Officers, which occaſioned this Ep. Anſ.* This *Ep.* is clear, that the People may not caſt out their Officers, doing their Work in Humility---but not a Word in it againſt their *Electing* of them, but clearly to the contrary; in theſe words, *the whole Church being therewith well pleaſed*, implyeth, that it is not to be done without them; and what Hand they can have in placing their Officers, that doth not amount to *Election*, I know not. He ſaith, *they took this courſe of Purpoſe to avoid Contentions.* What courſe doth he mean? It cannot be meant of Obtruding Officers on the *Church*; for he ſaith, *they muſt be well pleaſed.* Therefore the Courſe muſt be appointing Officers Authoritatively by *Ordination*; who being ſo appointed, could not be ejected again, *quemdiu ſe bene geſſerunt*, as appeareth by *Clem.* inſtancing the *Bleſſoming of* Arons *Rod*, to put an end to the Emulation among the Tribes; which was a Striſe not about *Election*, but about changing of the ſetled Officers of the *Church*. He ſaith, *all that the People had to do, was to give their Teſtimony. Clem.* ſaith, *they muſt be well pleaſed.* And it is clear, that that excludeth obtruding Paſtors on people, either by Patrons, or the Magiſtrate, or *Biſhop*. He ſaith, *it ſeems probable to him, that the reaſon of the Faction among them was, that ſome repreſented it as a Grievance, that thoſe Officers were appointed by others, not choſen by them.* Why this ſhould ſeem to him, I know not; except that prejudice repreſenteth things otherwiſe than they are; as coloured Spectacles do. It ſeemeth to me there could be no ſuch thought among the People, becauſe *Clement* ſuppoſeth the Officers to have been choſen by themſelves; the whole Church being well pleaſed. That theſe Factious Men had no Objection againſt the *Preſbyters* themſelves; the Dr. Aſſerts, but he doth not prove: It is true, *Clem.* ſuppoſeth there was no Ground for Objection; and therefore they could not be caſt out, while they were humble, quiet, ready, and blamleſs; but for all that, Factious Men will find fault, and pick quarrels, with the moſt innocent men.

Sect. 11. He next bringeth *Cyprian* to plead againſt *popular Election*; that is, to plead againſt himſelf. For he ſaith, *p.* 316. *That he requireth no more but their Teſtimony, that it be done*, ſub populi Aſſiſtentia

Assistentis conscientia; *that by their presence, either their Faults might be published, or their good Acts commended, that so it might appear to be a just, and lawful Ordination, which hath been examined by the Suffrages of all*: And after *Cyprian* saith, *It came down from Divine Tradition, and Apostolick practice that a Bishop should be chosen*, plebe præsente (*not by the Votes of the people*, (says the *Doctor*.) One would think all this time, the *Doctor* is secretly undermining his own cause; and yet will out-face plain light to defend it. Doth not *Cyprian* mention the Suffrages of all, and yet the Doctor maketh him deny them Votes; if their presence, their Testimony, commending or publishing the faults of the Candidate, their knowledge, and assistance, can consist with Patronage, and obtruding of Ministers on the people, as a Master of a Flock setteth a Sheepherd over his Sheep (it is one of *Bellarmin*'s Arguments for the Doctor's Conclusion.) If these do not import the peoples consent to be required; and so amount to *Election*; let any indifferent Reader judge. It is plain that *Cyprian* not only alloweth the people this power, but maketh it a Divine Right; and maketh *Ordination* without it to be unjust, and unlawful: Wherefore if we should adhere to *Cyprian*'s judgment, there would be few Ministers in the *Church* of *England*; and so more cause for *separation* than he is aware of; but I do not improve his Testimony to that end. The Doctor, *p.* 317. bringeth *Cyprians* Testimony, *That it belongeth chiefly to the people to refuse the bad, and chuse the good*; and yet hath the Brow to say, That this is no more then their Testimony; but if Testimony be chusing, we require no more but Testimony. It is nothing to the purpose that *Lampridius* says Severus, *proposed the Names of Governors of Provinces to the people, to see what they had to say against them*; *and that this will not infer popular Election of these Governors*. For 1. This was never declared to be necessary, and appointing Governours unjust or unlawful without it, as it is in our case. 2. We have proved, that the people have power of Suffrage, and of *chusing*: which was not granted by *Severus*. That *Origen* saith a *Bishop* must be *Ordained* Astante populo, is such an Argument against us, as sheweth a very weak cause, especially when so Learned a Man thought better to use it then say nothing. For it is *Election* we speak of, not *Ordination*; in which we confess, the people have no hand, neither doth *Origen* say, That this *Ordination* could proceed without the peoples being more concerned about the person, than standing by while he was Ordained; and yet even this

this favour is not granted to the people in *England*, the *Biſhop* will not be at the pains to come to the ſeveral Pariſhes to ordain the Miniſters before the people.

Sect. 12. The 2. thing that the Dr. inſiſteth on is, *p.* 318. *That the people upon this, Aſſuming the power of Elections, cauſed great Diſturbance, and diſorders in the Church.* To this I anſwer in general, 1. I deſire to know on what the people aſſumed the power of *Election*, whether on Chriſt's Inſtitution, or any ſubſequent ground; if the latter let him ſhew it, if the former, it is improper to ſay they aſſumed, what was ever their due: The Doctor ſeemeth to ſpeak of it as an act of the people, after that priviledge had been out of their hand for ſome time. 2. There is no Inſtitution of Chriſt, but inconveniences may follow on it, as long as ſinful men have the managing of it: Hath none followed on *Church Power* in the hands of *Biſhops*, and *Presbyters*? Yea, of civil power in the hands of Magiſtrates; yea, of power of *Election*, in the hands of *Patrons*. It were eaſie to fill a Volume with Hiſtories to this purpoſe: Will the Doctor thence conclude, that all theſe ſhould be aboliſhed? 3. As few inconveniences can be inſtanced, as following on the peoples *Election* of their Paſtors, as of moſt other things. The Doctor inſtanceth but four in the ſpace of 1000 years, that this power of the people laſted unviolated; and that through all the Chriſtian *Churches*. I do not deny but more there might be; but when ſo few occurr as obſervable to a man of ſo great reading, it ſaith more againſt the Doctors deſign, than all theſe Inſtances ſay for it. 4. Moſt of theſe diſturbances fell out by the Ambition of *Biſhops* influencing the people, and leading them into Factions; and were occaſioned by the worldly advantage of *Epiſcopacy*, in the degenerate State of the *Church*; and were not to be ſeen where *Biſhops* kept within due bounds, and were in a mean condition; ſo that indeed this Conſideration is more againſt *Epiſcopal* grandeur, and imparity, than againſt popular *Elections*. As is evident from *Ammian. Marcellin.* whom the Doctor citeth, as the Author of that Story of a Bloody *Election* at *Rome*, when the Conteſt was about *Damaſus*, where he ſheweth, That *they aſpired to that Biſhoprick with all their might, conſidering how the Biſhop was enriched*, Oblationibus Matronarum, *rode in Chariots, were Gorgeouſly attired, fared ſumptuouſly*, and ſaith, *They might have ſhuned theſe inconveniences, had they deſpiſed this grandeur, and imitated the Biſhops in the Provinces, whoſe humble carriage, poor fare, and mean habit, commended them to God*

and

and good men. 5. It is worth our Obſervation, that not one of theſe Diſorders fell out for 300 years after Chriſt, when the Church was in her Integrity, and had not degenerated, as ſhe did afterward. 6. There is a better means of preventing theſe diſturbances, to wit, the Magiſtrate ought to ſuppreſs them; and the Rulers of the *Church* ought to regulate *Elections*, and take away the exerciſe of that power from the unruly, as they take the *Sacraments*, though peoples priviledge, from them that walk unworthy of them. When inconveniences fall in, we muſt take God's way not our own, to ſet things right again.

Sect. 13. This might ſuffice for Anſwer to all, the Doctors Alledgeances on this head; but further there is not ſo fair a repreſentation made of matters of fact as need were. For the *1ſt.* Inſtance, the Diſorder at *Antioch*, it was not as he repreſenteth it, about the chuſing of a new *Biſhop* to a vacant place; but about putting an *Arian Biſhop* (at leaſt ſuppoſed to be ſo) into the place of *Euſtathius*, who had long been peaceably in that place, and regularly choſen; but was injuriouſly depoſed by the *Arians*. Neither was *Euſtathius* choſen at laſt (as the Doctor ſaith) but rid out the Storm, and kept his place againſt the violent attempts of theſe *Hereticks*. And therefore this Inſtance is wide from the purpoſe. The next Inſtance is at *Cæſarea*: The perſon that carried the *Election* was *Baſil*, the Magiſtrates, and the worſt of the people oppoſing him. Of this *Nazianzen* juſtly complaineth; and it cannot be juſtified; but cannot infer, that popular *Elections* ſhould be taken away. *Gregorius Nazianzenus*'s wiſh to that purpoſe, is unduly repreſented; it was, That the *Election might be in the hands of the Clergy, and the more holy part of the people*, and that not only, but *μάλιϛα Chiefly*. This doth evince that he looketh on the right of *Election* to be in them; and only wiſhed, that bad men might be deprived of the uſe of that priviledge; and ſo do we, when they abuſe it: So it be taken from them orderly. The *3d.* Inſtance is at *Alexandria*, where *Dioſcurus* was choſen, and *Proterius* killed. This is a groſs miſtake, or miſrepreſentation. It was not at the *Election*; but long after, yea, *Proterius*'s Murder was 5 or 6 years after; beſide, it was done, and the Sedition raiſed by *Hereticks*: Shall not the *Church* chuſe her Paſtors now, becauſe *Papiſts* would oppoſe it, if they be not curbed? Of the *4th* Inſtance I have already ſpoken; to wit, that at *Rome* about *Damaſus*. What he ſaith of *Chryſoſtom*, *Jerom*, and others, complaining of peoples unfit-

unfitneſs to Judge, doth not prove his point: For all theſe Men were for popular *Election*, as I have ſhewed above. Beſide, that the Paſtor's fitneſs is to be judged by the *Ordainers*, after the *Electors* have done their part.

Sect. 14. His third thing is, *p.* 320. That to prevent theſe inconveniences many *Biſhops* were appointed without the *choice* of the people, and *Canons* were made for regulation of *Elections*. For proof of this, he telleth us, that at *Alexandria* the *Biſhop* was not only to be choſen out of the twelve *Presbyters*, but by them, and citeth for this *Jerome*, *Ep. ad Enagrium*, *Severus*, and *Almacintus*, and *Hilarius* the Deacon. *Anſw.* 1. It is no wonder the *Biſhop* was choſen out of the *Presbyters*, *and by them*; for he was their Moderator, and had no power over the people, more than the reſt had; as hath been ſhewed above: If he can prove that he was choſen to be Paſtor of his particular Flock without their conſent, that were to the purpoſe. 2. This can make nothing for *Patronages*, or the Magiſtrate obtruding a paſtor on the people, or a ſingle *Biſhop* doing it. 3. *Jerome*'s words are, *Presbyteri unum ex ſelectum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Epiſcopum nominabant*; he ſaith, not *unum a ſelectum*: *Severus* ſpeaketh not a word of the *Presbyters electing* alone: What is ſaid by *Hilarius* of the altering of the cuſtom, is not who ſhould *Elect*; but that he might be *Elected* either from among the *Presbyters*, or from any place elſe. What is all this againſt *popular Elections*? We find (ſaith he) *Biſhops* Conſecrating others (in the room of the deceaſed) in ſeveral *Churches*, without mention of choice made by the people: and mentioneth ſeveral inſtances. *A.* A negative Teſtimony in this caſe ſignifieth nothing. The *Election* being the conſtant practiſe, might well be ſuppoſed, but needed not be mentioned. That *Severus* of *Milevis*, and *Auguſtine* named, their Succeſſors is no proof, unleſs he prove that they were obtruded on the People without their conſent: No doubt any man, more the Great *Auguſtine*, may name a Miniſter to the People; but this taketh not away the Peoples free conſent or choice; which the *Dr.* doth not deny to have been had in both theſe Caſes. Yea, *Auguſtine* himſelf took it ill, that *Severus* named his Succeſſor, without acquainting the People, and therefore in his own caſe did acquaint them.

Sect. 15. What he alledgeth out of the Greek *Canoniſts* (whom he doth not name, and ſo cannot be examined) that the *Council of* Nice took away the power of *Election* from the people; is incon-

ſiſtant with the Epiſtle of that ſame Synod above mentioned; and therefore theſe *Canoniſts* are not to be believed: He citeth *Concil. Antioch*; to ſhew that *Biſhops* were ſometimes conſecrated without the conſent of the People; which that *Council* doth not approve; but rather alloweth the people to reject ſuch a one; yet they will have him to retain the Honour, and Office. The words are, *Si Epiſcopus ordinatus, ad paræciam minime cui eſt electus, acceſſerit, non ſuo vitio, ſed aut axuia cum populus volet---- hic & honoris ſic & Miniſterii particeps.*---- This ſeemeth to ſhew the *Election* of the people to be neceſſary to a Mans officiating as their Paſtor; whether it go before *Ordination*, or follow after it: The ſame *Council*, *Can.* 17. mentioneth the caſe of a *Biſhop*, conſecrated, and neglecting to go to his charge; which the *Dr.* improveth to ſhew, that a *Biſhop* was not always conſecrated in his *Church*. I deny not, that ſuch abuſes were committed: The *Council* doth not approve of ſuch a thing; nor doth it hence follow, that it was ordinary, but rather the contrary; it is pitty to ſee the *Dr.* put to ſuch ſhifts, as to inſtance *Gregorius*, being made *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* before he went thither; ſeeing this was done by the *Arians*, and he took poſſeſſion by military Force, and it was diſliked by the reſt of the eminent Perſons of the *Churches*. But the main thing that maketh this inſtance to be inimitable, is, that *Anaſtaſius* was in the place, and by this means expelled. The next Inſtance of *Baſil* ordaining *Euphronius* before the peoples conſent, was irregular; but that he behoved to have the peoples conſent before he ſetled there, maketh it wholly impertinent to the thing in hand. Nothing can be leſs to the purpoſe, than what followeth, of the peoples pititioning the *Metropolitan* to *Ordain* their *Biſhop*; for this ſuppoſeth their *Election* of him; and that the *Metropolitan* had power to refuſe him, is no more then we allow to the *Presbytery*, who may reject an unqualified perſon, tho' *choſen* by the people. The *Dr.* is not yet weary of Writing beſide the purpoſe, when he telleth us of a *Canon* of the *Council of Laodicea*, that a *Biſhop* choſen by the people, taking poſſeſſion without the Provincial Synod, was to be turned out: We ſay the ſame; becauſe the people may *Elect*; but the Paſtors muſt *Ordain*. This doth not ſhew (as he alledgeth) that the buſineſs of *Election* was in the *Eaſt*, brought into the *Biſhops* power, but only that the peoples *Election* was not ſufficient without the *Biſhops*, and other Paſtors *Ordination*.

Sect. 16. He next citeth *Juſtinians* Law; that the Clergy, and better ſort of Citizens name three to the *Metropolitan*; whence the

Dr.

Dr. inferreth, that the common People were excluded from the *Election*. *Anſ.* 1. *Juſtinians* Law cannot make void the Law of God and they that have not given their Names to *Eraſtus*, do think that Chriſt's Laws, which are to be declared by his *Church*, and not *Juſtinians* Laws ſhould take place in the *Church* of God. 2. It is not ſaid they muſt preſent Three; but they might do it; but they might alſo preſent two, or but one. 3. It is not ſaid, that the Clergy and better Citizens were to *Elect*; but they were ἐκθέσασθαι, that is, to draw up the Decrees, as they were then called, wherein the *Election* was contained. 4. In another Law of *Juſtinian*, it is appointed that the *Election* be made by the Inhabitants of the City. And I hope he will not impute Contradictions to *Juſtinian's* Laws. He next objecteth *Concil. Laodic. can.* 13. He doth not cite the Words, and I meet only with the Title in theſe Words, *Deo quod non ſit populis concedendum electionem facere eorum quam altaris Miniſterio ſit applicandi.* *Anſ.* If this be meant of excluding the People wholly, it is inconſiſtent with other *Canons* above cited, and therefore not to be minded. Therefore the meaning muſt rather be, that the *Election* is not to be left to the Rable; but they are to be aſſiſted, and directed in that Action by the *Presbyters*, and better ſort of the People. The Second *Council of* Nice, is next cited; but much amiſs; for it is *Ordination*, not *Election* that is reſtrained to *Biſhops*, *i. e.* not to be done without them; and *Election* is only taken out of the Hand of the Magiſtrate. That Second Council citeth for Conformation of their Decree, the Fourth *Can.* of *Concil. Nice.* 1. Where there is not a Word of *Election* by *Biſhops*, but only of *Ordination*. He concludeth with *Concil. Conſtantinop.* 2. *Can.* 28. *Carazanze* hath it, 22. Whereas the *Greek Church* owned but Fourteen of theſe *Canons*; and the reſt are look'd on as a Forgery. Beſide, That *Council* was in the end of the Ninth Century; when the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had got very high; and therefore leſs to be regarded.

Sect. 17. The Fourth thing the Dr. conſidereth, is, p. 323. That *the Magiſtrate, when Chriſtian, did interpoſe in this, as he judged expedient.* *Anſ.* We are not againſt the Magiſtrates interpoſing; to repreſs Tumults, aſſiſt the Oppreſſed, oppoſe unpeaceable Perſons, *&c.* But the queſtion is, Whether the Magiſtrate did take away the *Election* from the People, and did interpoſe generally; and when there was no ſpecial neceſſity for his interpoſing. 2. We deny not but ſome Magiſtrates did interpoſe againſt Right, and Rea-

ſon; but *quo jure* did they do ſo. But let us hear his Inſtances; the firſt is, *Conſtantine recommended to the* Synod, *two Men to chuſe either of them, or whom they ſhould judge fit, without taking notice of the Intereſt of the People.* *Anſ.* 1. This is far from taking away the Peoples right, to deprive them of the preſent uſe of it, on occaſion of their diſſenſion. 2. How doth he prove, that no notice was taken of the Peoples Intereſt: That it is not mentioned, is no proof; it was ſo univerſally owned in thoſe days, that it might well be ſuppoſed without mention. 3, Yea, the Emperour in his *Ep.* to the People of *Antioch*, doth mention it ſeveral times, as *Euſebius* relateth, for he willeth them not to deſire the *Biſhop of Antioch*; but to chuſe one according to the Cuſtom of the *Church*, as our Saviour had directed them. His next inſtance is, in a Diſſenſion at *Conſtantinople*, about *Paulus*, and *Macedonius*. The *Emperour Conſtantius* put them both by; and put in *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*. And after his Death, when the Oxthodox party chuſed *Paulus*, the Emperour put him out by force, and put in *Macedonius*. *Anſ.* Such Inſtances will be little to the Credit of his cauſe; for all this was done by a perſecuting *Emperour Conſtantius*, for rooting out the ſound Faith, and planting *Arianiſm*; and was complained of by all the *Orthodox*, as an Encroachment on the Liberties of the *Church*. What followeth is far ſhort of the point; to wit, the *Emperours* reſtoring *Athenaſius*, and ſeveral other *Biſhops*, who had been duly *Elected* and *Ordained*, and by him thruſt from their places. Next, *Theodoſius* would have *Nectarius* made *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, when many of the *Biſhops* oppoſed it. *Anſ.* This maketh more againſt *Epiſcopal Ordination*, than againſt *Popular Election*. But that the peoples *Election* was not here *Impedited*, is clear from the *Synod* at *Ep.* cited above, *Sect.* 6. where the conſent of the whole City is mentioned. Next, *Chryſoſtom was appointed by the Emperour to* Conſtantinople, *without the People, for* Palladius *doth not mention any conſent, but what was ſubſervient to the Emperours determination.* *Anſ.* Whether the conſent was Antecedent or Subſequent, if it was, it deſtroyeth his deſign. Beſide, both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* do expreſly mention the peoples Votes; and *Palladius*, whom the Dr. in this leaneth to, doth not deny them. Next, he ſaith, the Emperour would have none of the Clergy of *Conſtantinople* choſen to ſucceed *Sinſinnius*; therefore *Neſtorius* was brought from *Antioch*. *Anſ.* It doth not follow that he was not choſen by the People; and the *Emperour* laying this reſtraint on the People, is only, if at all, excuſable, becauſe he fear-

ed

ed disturbance: Such pretences have often given occasion to Oppression. His last instance is, *Proctus* was made *Bishop* by the *Emperours* order, before the Burial of his Successor. *Ans.* It is not proved that the People did not chuse him, yea, the People had chosen him before *Maximanus* his predecessor got the place, and he being now dead, he might enter in without the Formality of a new choice. Let the Reader now judge, whether any Orthodox *Emperour* did ever disown this priviledge of the People, either by declaring that the power was not in them, but in himself, or by interposing ordinarily, or without hazard of the Civil Peace, in the *Elections* of the Pastors of the *Church*; wherefore the Dr. in all this hath said nothing, that can conclude against this power of the people.

Sect. 18. His fifth Consideration, p. 325. is, That *upon the alteration of the Government of Christendom, there was greater reason for the Magistrates interposing than before.* I suppose by the *alteration of the Government of Christendom*; the reverend Author meaneth the breaking of the *Roman Empire*, and the setting up of many *Kingdoms* out of it; which fell out in the latter, and very corrupt times of the *Church*: Himself dateth it from the endowment of *Churches*, by the liberality of the *Northern Princes.* Against this I argue, 1. This practice being so long after the *Churches* purity began to decay; and when Christian Religion was almost destroy'd by the encrease of Apostacies, and when *Princes*, and *Prelates* had, as it were divided the spoiles of the *Church* between them; and robbed the People both of their Rights, and many of the *Ordinances* of God, as to the purity of them; it hath no weight to conclude against the Peoples right of *Election*, which they had from Christ, and enjoyed in the purer Ages of the *Church*, for many Centuries of years. If this reasoning have any force, it will make as much for the *Mass*, *Images*, *denying the Cup in the Lord's Supper* to the People; and many such things, which I hope the Dr. will not argue for; tho' he unwarily saith more for them, than would have been expected. 2. He acknowledgeth, p. 325. That this was obtained by *Princes* by degrees, and indeed it was very late before it became common; and the Power was wholly wrested out of the peoples Hands. He confesseth that this way was not always observed in the days of *Clotharius* in *France* (which of them he meaneth, I know not; there were three of that Name; the first of them was about the Year 560. the last a hundred years after) now if the Infancy of this usage was so late,

late, and it grew by degrees; the adult State of it muſt be (as indeed it is) a very *Novel* device of men to ſubject Religion to their Luſts.

Sect. 19. 3. I deny that on that alteration of Government in the State, there was either greater reaſon than before, or any reaſon, for *Princes* to interpoſe ſo in the *Election* of the Paſtors of the *Church*, as to take it out of the peoples Hand. That there was no greater reaſon then before I prove, both becauſe he cannot ſhew us ſuch reaſon; and alſo becauſe before this, there were Tumults, and Confuſions, which might require the Magiſtrates interpoſition; and alſo becauſe the Chriſtian *Emperours* had as much power over the *Church* in their large Dominions, as Chriſtian Kings could pretend to in their leſſer Kingdoms. No difference in this can be aſſigned, either from any grant of Chriſt to the one, more then to the other; nor from ſound reaſon. That which the *Dr.* bringeth for a Reaſon, is none at all; to wit, The *Northern Princes endowing Churches liberally*: For, 1. Did not the *Emperours* ſo too. *Conſtantin*'s liberality was exceeding great, which occaſioned that ſaying, *hodie venenum infuſum eſt in Eccleſiam*, and yet he laid not out that Treaſure to purchaſe the Rights that Chriſt had given to his People. 2. The Liberality was no ſufficient price to purchaſe Goſpel Priviledges, from them that Chriſt had granted them to, more than *Jacobs* Pottages was for *Eſaus*'s Birth-right. It is a Conceit unworthy of a Divine, and only fit for *Simon Magus*; that the Liberality of Princes, or others, to the *Church*, can entitle them to be Maſters of her priviledges. As there is no more reaſon now then before, ſo there neither was, nor is any reaſon at all, why Magiſtrates ſhould meddle with the *Election* of *Church* Officers; becauſe it is the peoples right, by Chriſt's Inſtitution, and hath been owned by the *Church*, and the Magiſtrate for many Ages, as hath been ſhewed above.

Sect. 20. The *Dr.* ſaith, that after the ſolemn Aſſemblies of the people came to be much uſed, theſe priviledges (in *Election* of *Church-men*) of *Princes* came not only to be Confirmed by the conſent of the people; but to be enlarged. This he inſiſteth much upon afterward; alledging that the people of *England*, by their repreſentatives in *Parliament*, have given away their power of *Election*, and put it into the Hand of the *Magiſtrates*, *Biſhops*, and other *Patrons*. *Anſ.* 1 I deny that the people could give away this right; it was Chriſt's Legacy to them, and not alienable by them. It doth

concern

concern their Souls, not their temporal Eſtates, and ſuch concerns are not at Mens diſpoſal. 2. I deny that this was done; people never gave away this Right; it was partly by violence, and partly by Fraud, wreſted out of their Hands; what he ſaith of the *Parliaments* giving it away, wherein the People are repreſented; is a miſtake; for the people are repreſented in *Parliament*, as they are Members of the Body Politick; and they intruſt all their worldly Intereſts, and Lives, and Eſtates, to them whom they chuſe; and they may diſpoſe of theſe, by making Laws to ſecure them; and alſo to take them away when the publick good doth ſo require; but they are not there repreſented, as they are Members of the *Church*; neither do they, or can they, entruſt the *Parliament* with the concerns of their Souls, or the *Church* Rights, and Priviledges: Theſe Chriſt hath made Laws about, and no Man can make Laws about them; all that men can do in reference to theſe is Miniſterial, not Magiſterial, as Acts of *Parliament* are; it is to declare Chriſt's Laws, and to put them in Execution; and Chriſt hath not entruſted *Kings*, nor *Parliaments* with theſe Affairs, but only his Miniſters; and the people can entruſt no other with them. The πρωτον ψευδος in this diſcourſe of the *Dr's*, on which all of it is built, is his confounding of *Church*, and *State*, with *Eraſtus*; which is to mingle Heaven and Earth.

Sect. 21. He ſaith, *The Princes obtained by degrees, not only the Confirmation of the Election, but the Liberty of Nomination, with a ſhadow of Election by the Clergy, and others of the Court, as appears by the formula of* Marculphus. *Anſw.* Here is plain dealing, both to let us ſee what fraudulent ways were uſed to cheat the people of their Right, by leaving a Shadow of *Election*, when the ſubſtance was taken away; and alſo that *Princes* were not in ancient poſſeſſion of this Priviledge, that they behoved by ſuch Policies, to wind themſelves into: And further, that it is ſo groſly evil, that *Princes* are aſhamed openly to own ſuch a Power over the *Church*; but muſt thus hide the ſhame of this practice; if they have a good Title, why leave they a ſhadow of *Election*? If not, why do they aſſume the ſubſtance of it? He citeth on the Margin, in Confirmation of this grant made to *Kings*; ſeveral Acts of *Councils*, as *Concil. Aurelian. An.* 549. but this deſtroyeth his cauſe, for *Can.* 3. (which I ſuppoſe is that he aimeth at) doth barely name the *King* (whoſe intereſt in all *Church* matters no man denyeth, ſo far as the peace of the State is concerned in them,) but expreſly requireth the *Election*

of

of the Clergy, and People; and again their conſent, and moreover maketh this *Election a clero & plebe*, to be as it is written in the Antient *Canons*, *Concil. Aurelan.* 2. *Can.* 7 doth alſo expreſly mention *popular Election*, and *Concil. Aurelian.* 3. *Can.* 2. doth require their conſent. And *Concil. Aurelian.* 4. *Can.* 4. requireth a *Biſhop* to be *ordained* in his *Church*, to which he was *Elected decreto*: that was the ordinary Term for the Writing, wherein the peoples *Election* was contained. And in all theſe *Canons*, there is not one word of the Magiſtrate, except in the firſt, as aboveſaid. His *Concil. Tarracon.* I cannot find, *Concil. Tolet.* 12. that he citeth, was in the end of the ſeventh *Century*; when Corruptions were come to a great height, and it was but provincial, it ſaith indeed, *quoſcunque poteſtas regia elegerit*; but the peoples *Election* is not exluded, tho not mentioned; and there is an expreſs *ſalvo* (it is the 6*th. Can.*) for the liberty of the Provinces, which cannot well be underſtood, but of the priviledge of the people of the Province.

Sect. 22. He telleth us of great Conteſts, between the *Papal*, and *Regal* power; and how the latter prevailed in *England*, and citeth ſeveral Acts of *Parliament*; as of *Edward* 6*th.* and others. *Anſw.* What doth all this prove? If two contend about a Third Perſons Eſtate, and the one prevail againſt the other, doth that give him a Title? We deny that either *Pope* or *Prince* had a right to that they ſtrove about; and neither poſſeſſion, nor Acts of *Parliament* can take that right that Chriſt hath given to his people, and beſtow it on another. His Allegation that the peoples conſent is ſwallowed up in the *Parliaments* Act, is anſwered above. That this right hath been owned in the *King* from the firſt planting of Chriſtianity in *England*, is ſaid with more confidence, than any ſemblance of Truth, or ſhadow of Reaſon: That *Edward* 3*d* aſſerted it in an Ep. *to Clement* will not prove it; men uſe big words, ſometimes inſtead of ſtrong Arguments; and I believe that his Aſſertion was ſo far true, that from the beginning of Chriſtianity here, the *Pope* had not that power which he had claimed, and which the *King* was debating with him.

Sect. 23. He ſaith, p. 326. That the right of inferior *Patronage* is juſtly thought to bear equal date with the firſt ſettlement of Chriſtianity in peace, and quietneſs. A bold Aſſertion: It muſt then have begun in the days of *Conſtantine* the Great. His proof of this is, *Presbyters* were ſetled in Country Cures, what then? In the Firſt *Council of Orange*, expreſs mention is made of *Patronage*, and it is reſerved

reſerved to the firſt Founders of the *Churches*: *If a Biſhop* (ſaith the *Dr.*) *built a Church on his own Land, in another Biſhop's Dioceſs, yet the right of preſenting the Clerk was reſerved.* When firſt I read this, I could think of no other Anſwer, but that this was far from what was to be proved. Chriſtianity was ſetled in peace long bef re this time; for I doubted not of the Truth of a Citation, made by a Man of ſo much Learning, Reading, and Integrity; but I now find it is fit we ſhould ſee with our own Eyes; for in that *Canon* (it is the 9*th.* the *Dr.* calleth it the 10*th.*) there is no mention, expreſly, nor implicite, of *Patronage*, nor preſenting of a Clerk; only this Favour is reſerved to the Builder of the *Church*, *ut quos deſiderat in re ſua videre, ipſos ordinetis, in cujus civitatis territorio eſt, vel ſi ordinati jam ſint, ipſos habere acquieſcat.* It is evident that no conteſt between the People and the *Biſhop* is here determined, who ſhould chuſe the Clerk; but between the *Biſhop* that builded the *Church*, and him in whoſe Dioceſs it is built. The Builder of the *Church* is to have his deſire, as to the Officers of the *Church*; and not the *Biſhop* in whoſe Dioceſs it is; but it may be rationally thought that the *Biſhop*'s deſire was not to croſs Chriſt's Inſtitution, nor the ancient *Canons*, in depriving the people of the *Election*. Such a deſire this Council could not grant him; nor is it rational to ſuppoſe, that they granted it. But it might be ſuppoſed, that the Builder of the *Church* might more influence the People (they being his own Vaſſals, or Tenants (as we now ſpeak) then the other *Biſhop*, in whoſe Dioceſs the *Church* was; and therefore the one is here decreed to have his deſire, rather than the other. He ſaith this was confirmed by *Concil. Arelat.* 2, *c.* 36. it is (*mihi*) *Can.* 35. Now let any judge, whether this *Canon* doth affirm any ſuch thing, or rather doth not ſpeak plainly for popular *Election*: The words of it are, *placuit, in ord natione Epiſcopi hunc ordinem cuſtodiri; ut primo loco, venalitate, vel ambitione, ſubrepta, ab Epiſcopis nec nominentur; de quibus Clerici vel Laici Cives erga unum eligendi habeant poteſtate.* The Relative *de quibus*, is not *Diacritick*, as if ſome might be named by the *Biſhops* (which is the only ground on which this *Canon* could be drawn into the *Dr.*'s deſign) for here *Biſhops*, (not a *Biſhop*) are mentioned; and the choice is of a *Biſhop*; not a *Presbyter*, of whom a *Biſhop* might be a *Patron*; the Relative is then to be underſtood, *Univerſaliter*, that the Clergy and Laity have the power of chuſing their *Biſhop*, and therefore the reſt of the *Biſhops* muſt not name him.

Sect. 26. He bringeth next the Constitutions of the *Emperours Zeno*, and *Justinian*. I have above answered to this; they were out of their Line, when they medled in these matters. The Citations themselves I cannot examine; not having the Books; but if they be like what goeth before, it is little matter. He saith, this was setled also in the *Western Church*, as appeareth by the *9th. Council of Toledo*. *Ans.* 1. This Council was held, *An.* 650. saith the Dr. 656. saith *Alstedius*; this was in a time, when Corruptions in the *Church* were come to a great height. 2. In this *Provincial Council* were but sixteen *Bishops*: With what face then can it be said, that what they did was brought into the *Western Church*? This it is to speak big words, instead of using strong Arguments. 3. The *1st. Canon* impowereth the Heirs of Founders of *Churches* to prevent Dilapidations in those *Churches*. The Second impowereth the Founder himself (*quum diu in hac vita superstes extiterit*) during Life, to have a care of these places, and to offer fit Rectors to serve in them. Where it is to be noted, 1. That the Founder might be presumed to be a good Man, by his liberality; and theremore trust might be reposed in him, as to this matter, but his Heirs who might be *profane*, *Hereticks*, or *Atheists*, are not intrusted with a concern of that nature, as it is with us: Where *Papists* must chuse a Minister for *Protestants*, or an *Atheist* or *Drunkard*, &c. 2. It is not said, that the people shall not chuse, nor must consent, but he was to offer a Pastor, which might well consist with the Peoples *Election*. All that followeth is nothing but a raking into the Dunghil of the latter Corruptions of the *Church*, to confirm this right of *patronage*, I therefore wave it.

Sect. 27. He is now arrived at his last consideration, p. 328. *Things being thus setled by general consent, and established by Laws, there is no ground for the people to resum the liberty of Elections.* I hope the weight of this is already taken of in the judgment of the unbyassed Reader; that there never was such general consent, nor Laws, till the Church was quite corrupted, and that these, if they had been, could not take away the peoples right of *Election*; and therefore they are to own it still. He giveth three reasons for this Assertion. 1. *It was not unalterable.* That is deny'd. 2. *No inconvenience can be alledged against the setled way of disposing of Livings, but may be remedied by Law, easier than those which will follow on popular Elections in a divided Nation.* *Ans.* 1. It is not only inconveniences that

that we object, but croſſing of Chriſt's Inſtitution. 2. The *Doctor* hath nothing in his eye but Livings; it is the Paſtoral Relation that we mind, and the concern of Souls in it: we deſire to know who put the power of diſpoſing of theſe into the hands of *Patrons*. 3. We deny his Aſſertion; for though the Law will reſtrain a *Popiſh Patron* from preſenting a *Popiſh Prieſt* that is openly ſo, yet he may preſent a *Proteſtant in Maſquerade*, or one of the meaneſt of men for parts, and other qualities of a Miniſter, which it is known they often do; when yet the Law of the Land can hardly reach the Man. And a *Debauched Patron* may preſent one who will not reprove him too ſeverely, who yet may have qualifications to ſatisfie the Law. But the diſſentions that ariſe among a divided people, may be remedied by *Church Diſcipline*; or if they break out into external diſorders by the Magiſtrate. 3. *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *other reformed Churches have thought this an unreaſonable pretence. Anſw.* Mens Authority muſt not preponderate with us, againſt that of Chriſt. He proveth what he ſaith, 1. By *Beza* declaiming againſt *popular Election*. ſee this in *Bez. Ep.* 83. *Anſw. Beza* ſpeaketh only againſt *Election* by the people, without their *Church-guides* to manage them in that action. The *Lutheran Churches* that he next addeth, are no Examples to us. Their way is much applauded by the *Church of England* men, much more then the way of *England* is by them: For as *Pezel. melific. hiſt. part* 3. p. 345. obſerveth, none did more fiercely perſecute the Exiles in Qu. *Mary*'s days, than they did in *Denmark*, *Lubeck*, *Roſtoch*, and eſpecially at *Hamburgh*. The *Salvo* of the Synod of *Dort* ſheweth, that they did not allow *Patronages*, but muſt proceed warily in removing them; which hath been the caſe of other *Churches*, but maketh againſt the Doctor's opinion, not for it. That the Miniſters in *France*, or the *Council of State* at *Geneva*, chuſe Miniſters and obtrude them on the people without their conſent, we deny.

Sect. 28. I have by what is ſaid, preoccupied moſt of the Doctor's Reaſons againſt Mr. *B.* contained *Sect.* 26. I ſhall only take notice of a few things. We make void no Laws about *Patronage*, but ſo far as they reſpect the peoples right of chuſing a paſtor for their Souls; and thus far they are caſſate by the Laws of Chriſt: As to *Temple* and *Tythes* (as he ſpeaks we medle not with *Laws* about them; only we wiſh the removing of them, as a Grievance; and that Rulers would provide for the *Church* in a way that the

peoples right of *Election* might not be hindered, nor reſtrained in its Exerciſe. Mr. *B.* objecteth. *p.*330. That the *Patron* by giving a right to *Temple* and *Tythes*, doth not make the man a Miniſter to that peoples Souls, and the *Parliament* cannot diſpoſe of peoples Souls. The Doctor inſtead of an Anſwer, giveth the meaning of this, that if the people be humerſome and factious, they may run after whom they pleaſe, in oppoſition to Laws. This is *ad populum fallras*, but no fair way of Arguing. The true meaning is, that though the *Patron* by Law, may give a man a title to the *Temple* and *Tythes*, and the people can neither keep him out of the *Church*, nor deny to pay his dues; yet the Law cannot make him their Paſtor without their conſent. I do not ſay, they ſhould run after another; it is fit they ſhould conſent to a tolerable perſon, ſo impoſed on them, for peace ſake; yet it is not the Law, but their conſent that maketh him their Miniſter: That *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, and *Papiſts* will put in for a ſhare in this priviledge, is but a mean objection; for Chriſt hath given people power to chuſe ſound Paſtors, not whom they will. The Doctor asketh, Whether all muſt have equal Votes? then the worſt, who are the moſt part will chuſe one like themſelves. *Anſw.* This is to be regulated by the Guides of the *Church*, the worſt are to be inſtructed; yea, and cenſured, if need be, and if they chuſe a bad man, the Paſtors are not to ordain him. He alledgeth, few are competent Judges. *Anſw.* Many can judge tolerably, and they who cannot, are to be guided by others: but the matter is not wholly left to their judgment, the *Elected* man being to be tryed by the Elderſhip. He enlargeth on the tumults, and ſtrifs in popular *Elections*: This hath been abundantly anſwered above. That the matter is devolved, on a few, doth not take away the right of others, who are willing to be adviſed by theſe few. The Doctor is as certain that Chriſt never gave people ſuch an unalterable right, as he is, that he deſigned Peace and Unity in the *Church*. This certainty is built on no good grounds, and therefore amounteth to no more but *fancy*. I have ſhewed ground for a contrary perſwaſion, and a way that Chriſt hath laid down for peace conſiſtent with this right.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

Of the Terms of Communion impoſed by the Church, and Firſt of the Liturgy.

THe Reverend Author is now at laſt, *Sect.* 26. come to that which I reckon the main plea for our withdrawing from the Communion of the *Church of England*; to wit, the *Terms of Communion*, that ſhe impoſeth on all that ſhall partake with her in the Ordinances of God, which we count unlawful, and therefore cannot ſubmit to them; the *Church* impoſeth them ſo, as none are permitted to joyn with her who forbear them; and therefore we cannot partake without them. This putteth us on a neceſſity of forbearing Communion with her; and the neceſſity of Worſhipping God, doth not ſuffer us to live without the Ordinances, and thence reſulteth a neceſſity of keeping *ſeparate* meetings, which our Brethren blame us for, and we blame them for forcing us to it againſt our will. If theſe *Terms of Communion*, upon due examination prove lawful, we refuſe not the blame of *ſeparation*, which we think as great as they do; but if they prove unlawful, then doth the blame lie at their door, who impoſe them. Yea, unbyaſſed men will ſay, that if the things be but indifferent, and of no neceſſity, the Impoſers cannot juſtifie the impoſing of them, when ſo ſad inconvenience followeth upon them.

Sect. 2. Theſe *Terms of Communion* in particular are, the *conſtant uſe of the Liturgy*, and the *Ceremonies*; which are the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, *Kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper*, and *obſerving of Holy-days*, that God hath not appointed. Other *Ceremonies* they have, which we alſo diſlike; but becauſe they are not impoſed as *Terms of Communion*, we do not here mention them. What is to be ſaid of *Godfathers*, and *Godmothers* in *Baptiſm*, we ſhall in its place examine. The Doctor excuſeth himſelf from ſaying any thing about the *Liturgy*, becauſe it hath lately been ſo very well defended by a Divine of this *Church*, citeing on his Margin, Dr. *Falconer's Vindi-*

Vindication of Liturgies, and I for the like cauſe forbear this debate, or anſwering Dr. *Falkoner*, that having been exceeding well done, *Anno* 1681. by the Learned *G. F.* in his *Queſtions between* the Conformiſt *and* Nonconformiſt, *truly ſtated, and briefly diſcuſſed*; which the Doctor if he had pleaſed to read the Writings on both ſides (the neglect of which he blameth us for) might have taken notice of before his *Third Edition* came out, 1682. But beſide that, neither Doctor *Falkoner*, nor any other, hath anſwered what hath been ſaid againſt the *Liturgy*, and the uſe of it, in the *Anatomy of the Service-Book*, *Intereſt of words in prayer*, *Smectyminis*, *Jerubbaal's neceſſity of Reformation*, and other pieces, to which I refer the Reader for ſatisfaction in this point. Although I have made ſome Collections on this ſubject, yet ſo much being ſaid by others; and neither the Doctor (nor any other) being pleaſed to Anſwer it; I alſo ſhall wave this Controverſie. Only hinting a few of the chief grounds of our Scruple in this matter, becauſe the *Dr.* p. 332,333. chargeth his Anſwerers with pretending to ſcruple, without giving reaſon for their Scruples.

Sect. 3. We do not ſimply, nor generally condemn Forms of Prayer; they may be uſed when that work cannot be tollerably performed without them; neither do we condemn joyning in ſuch a way of praying even when the man that chuſeth that way might and ought to do otherwiſe: Neither do we ſcruple joyning in the uſe of the *Liturgy*, meerly becauſe it is impoſed by Authority. I know we are miſrepreſented in all theſe. But 1. We condemn uſing of ſet Forms of Prayer, either in private, or publick, without ſuch neceſſity, as that duty cannot be tollerably performed without that help. 2. We think it unlawful for the Church, or any other, to impoſe on the Miniſters of the Goſpel the uſe of a ſet Form of Praying, where there is not abſolute neceſſity. 3. We think in the preſent caſe of the *Church*, there is no ſuch abſolute neceſſity of that impoſition, ſeeing Miniſters may be had, who are tollerably gifted for their Work: And ſeeing it is Chriſt's Inſtitution that none but ſuch ſhould be in the Miniſtery; and ſeeing any Eſcapes, or Indecencies that can be obſerved in a Miniſters Adminiſtrations, are to be Corrected by the Diſcipline of the *Church*; which is Chriſt's way, not by impoſing a *Liturgy*, which is Mans way. 4 We think it unlawful for Miniſters, who are tollerably gifted for their Work, (and if they be not ſuch, in the judgment of the *Church*, they ſhould lay

lay aſide that Work, and betake themſelves to other Callings.) To ſubmit to ſuch Impoſitions, or to uſe ſuch Forms of Prayer. 5. What is ſaid of Forms of Prayers, let it be alſo underſtood of Forms of Preaching, Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and Exhortations at them, and of other parts of the Service of God: Here we may rationally except Forms of ſinging praiſe unto God, and that on two Grounds. 1. The Scripture hath furniſhed the *Church* with ſuch Forms for all caſes of a Soul, and of the *Church*, in the Book of *Pſalms*, which is not done in Prayer, and other Adminiſtrations. So that theſe Forms are not humane, as other Forms muſt be. 2. The Gift of compoſing Spiritual Songs, fit to be ſung in the *Church*, is not to be expected that it ſhould be Commonly given to the Paſtors of the *Church*, as the Gifts of Preaching and Praying are given. 6. We think it unlawful for people to joyn in Worſhipping God, by a frame of Service, not inſtituted, nor warranted in the Word of God; both as to the matter, and as to the manner of it. 7. The *Engliſh Service Book* is ſuch a frame of Service as is not warranted, nor inſtituted in the Word; and ſo it is unlawful for us to joyn in Worſhipping God by it.

Sect. 4. If we can give good reaſon for the *2d*, *4th*, *6th*, and *7th*, of theſe Aſſertions, ſufficient ground will appear for our ſcrupling the uſe of the *Liturgy*, impoſed as one of the *Terms of our Communion* with the *Church of England*. For the Firſt of theſe, That Men may not impoſe ſet Forms on Gifted Miniſters. Arguments for this are, 1. There is no warrant for ſuch practice; if there be, it muſt be either Chriſt's Command, or his Permiſſion, or the neceſſity of it: The firſt nor ſecond is not alledged, becauſe no ſuch thing can be proved from the Word. Nor the third, for ſuch a neceſſity is contrary to our ſuppoſition, that the men, ſo impoſed on, are gifted. If it be ſaid, the beſt gifted may ſlip into unfit expreſſions. *Reply*, This unfitneſs is either tolerable, and ſo no neceſſity can ariſe from that hazard; or intolerable, and then it is to be cured by Chriſt's means, *Church Diſcipline*, not by the invention of man. 2. No ſuch impoſition, nor uſage was ever heard of in the *Apoſtolick Church*, nor in the *Primitive Church* for 300 years and more; and yet there were Miniſters ſubject to Infirmities, as Men now are; and the Worſhip of God was by them fitly managed. May not the means of ſecuring Worſhip from abuſe, ſerve us that ſerved them? Or will we be wiſer and more wary than they?

That

That there was any Forms used or imposed in the Apostles times, we need not prove, the *Lord's Prayer* is no Instance to the contrary, it cannot be made appear, that ever it was intended to be a form of words, or used as such. And for the Primitive times, it is evident that when *Constantine* would help his Souldiers, newly come out of *Heathenism*, with a Form he behoved to get some composed, which needed not, had they then been in the *Church*. *Justin Martyr*, Apol. 2. p. 98. *Edition. Paris.* giving account of their publick Exercises on the Lord's day; to wit, reading Scripture, Exhortation, Prayer, Singing, Administration of the Lord's Supper, he saith, ὁ προέστως εὐκας, ὁ μόιως καὶ εὐκαρίστιας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπεμπει. That is, the Minister sendeth up Prayers and Thanksgivings, as he is able; then not by Book, but his Ability as the Lord furnished him. *Tertullian*, Apol. *c.* 30. saith, *They prayed in their Assemblies, sine monitore, quum de pectore*; and in his Book *de Oratiore*, he sheweth that there are many things to be asked according to every ones occasions; the Lord's Prayer being laid as a Foundation: where the true use of the Lord's prayer (note that by the way) is hinted; to wit, to be a *Directory*, not a *Form*. *Socrates* Hist. Eccles. *lib.* 5. *c.* 21. which is wholly spent in shewing what diversity of usages was in the Primitive times, in divers places; and how little weight was laid on *uniformity* (the great Argument for the *Common-prayer*) hath these words, καθολυμεντοι, παντακοῦ ἡ παρὰ πάσκις θρεσκείαις τῶν εὐχῶν οὐκ ἐσὶν εὑρεῖν σύο συμφόνουσας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτο. that is generally and every where, in all Religions, in Prayer, there are not two to be found that agree in one; which surely must be meant of Agreement in the same words.

Sect. 5. A third Argument for this is, such imposing doth thwart one great design of Prayer in publick, which is to lay out before the Lord all the several cases of the people, or the *Church*; their sins, and wants; which do so vary, that no Book can suit them all; I am sure ours doth not. If it be answered, this design may be answered by leaving a liberty to Ministers sometimes, as after Sermon to use their gifts. I reply, that this Liberty doth frustrate the design of set prayer, which is to prevent venting of error, and indecency, is not that hazard in permitting prayer after Sermon, as well as at other times: Wherefore either this imposing must shut out all Prayer; or it is a needless thing, and so unlawful in the *Church*. *Argument* 4. Imposing set Forms on the Ministers of the Gospel,

Goſpel, is a reſtraining, if not making void the *Chariſmata*, the Gifts of the Spirit that the Lord hath furniſhed his Miniſters with, for the benefit of the Church. For clearing and confirming this Argument, I offer theſe Conſiderations. 1. The Lord hath furniſhed his Church with Gifts that are needful for her edification. There was a large pouring out of the Spirit at firſt, *Act.* 2. 1. and tho' that degree and manner, and ſome of the uſes of it, be ceaſed; yet the thing it ſelf ſhall never ceaſe, *Iſa.* 59. 21. for without the Gifts of the Spirit, the Church could not ſubſiſt, 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. It is by the Holy Ghoſt that we muſt profeſs Chriſt, preach him, pray in his Name, *&c.* Hence Chriſt ſent the Spirit in his own room, when he left off to manage the Affairs of the Church in his perſon, as he had done on earth in the days of his humiliation; and the Spirit is on this account called by the Ancients *Vicarius Chriſti*. 2. The Gifts of the Spirit are particularly given to the Miniſters of the Goſpel, for aſſiſting them to manage their work for the Churches advantage: For theſe Gifts are mentioned with reference to them, and their work, and the fruit of their work; as is clear, *Eph.* 4. 8, 11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. with 1.---having diſcuſſed of diverſity of Gifts, the Apoſtle there ſheweth to whom eſpecially they are given. 3. The ordinary Miniſters of the Goſpel, have their intereſt in theſe Gifts, and a ſhare of them (tho' differently) as well as the extraordinary: For both ſorts are mentioned in both the places laſt cited.

Sect. 6. 4. The Spirit is given to Miniſters, and people; as for other ſupplies, ſo to aſſiſt them in right managing the work of Prayer; and that not only to aſſiſt as to the manner of praying, or praying Graces, and Affections; but as to the matter of Prayer, to furniſh the mind with fit and pertinent Petions, *Rom.* 8. 26. *The Spirit* not only *helpeth our Infirmities by making interceſſion with Groans*, but on account that *we know not what to Pray for as we ought*. The Spirit alſo giveth utterance, *Act.* 2. 4. 1 *Cor.* 1. 5. 5. It is the will of Jeſus Chriſt, that his Miniſters ſhould make uſe of the Gifts that he hath given for their proper ends; to wit, the Edification of the *Church*, that they ſhould pray for them, improve them, and uſe them; yea, lean to the help of the Spirit, not to the Book for helping their Infirmities. This is clear from, *Rom.* 12. 6. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Miniſters muſt give account to their Maſter, of the Uſe and Improvement of their Gifts: this is clear, not only from the Pa-

rable, *Mat.* 25.19. Tho' *Theologica Parabolica* is ſaid not to be *Argumentativa*; yet none denyeth, that an Argument may be brought from the Scope of a Parable; which here is to ſhew, that God will reckon with men about their uſing, and improving what he entruſteth them with. But the thing is evident of it ſelf; for this giving of Gifts to Men, cannot be imagined to be, that men may uſe them or not, as they will; or as other men will; but for the ends they were given for. 7. It is Chriſt's appointment, that none ſhould be in the Miniſtery, but Gifted Men: they muſt be apt to teach, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. That is fit for their work, in all the parts of it. 8. The Impoſing of ſet Forms doth hinder the exerciſe of the Gifts that Miniſters have received, and ſo hindereth that Edification, that the Church ſhould receive by that means. This cannot be denyed, when ever they uſe ſet Forms; there is no uſe of theſe Gifts. All theſe put together, may warrant us to conclude, that impoſing of ſet Forms on Miniſters of the Goſpel, is a reſtraining; yea, in a great meaſure,, a making void, of theſe Gifts that are given them to profit with all. I conclude this with the opinion of *Wickliff*, that *to bind men to Set and Preſcript Forms of Prayers, doth derogate from that liberty that Chriſt hath given them. Full. Ch. Hiſt. lib.* 3. *cent.* 14. *Pag.* 133.

Sect. 7. The Proof of the ſecond thing that I undertake; to wit, That it is unlawful for Miniſters to ſubmit to ſuch a reſtraining of their Gifts by ſuch Impoſitions as was mentioned. It followeth from what hath been already diſcourſed; all the Arguments for the former Aſſertion do alſo prove this, for they ought not to worſhip God in a manner, that is neither warranted by any neceſſity, nor by Chriſt's allowance, that were to worſhip God by the Preſcript of Mans Will alone. Neither is it lawful to ſerve God in the way, that the *Apoſtate uſed* uſed; but was never uſed by the *Church* in her beſt times: Nor ought we to croſs the deſign of Prayer by our way of praying; nor to make void the Gifts given to profit the *Church* by. All which, this way of being Tied up to ſet Forms, hath been proved to be guilty of.

Sect. 8. The next thing to be proved, is our ſixth Propoſition; to wit, That it is unlawful to worſhip God by a Frame of Service, that is not warranted in the word, both as to its matter, and manner. This I prove, 1. From Chriſt's condemning the *Traditions of Men* as *vain Worſhip*, *Mat.* 15. 9. They taught theſe *Traditions*,

e. i.

e. i. ſaith *Lucas Burgenſis, in locum*; they followed them, and taught others to follow them. The ſame Author calleth theſe *Mens Traditions*, that, are ſo of men; that they are not of God; or are deviſed by Man, *ibid.* So alſo *Vatablus*, *Eraſmus*, *Maldonate*, *Tirinus*, *Piſcator*, *Calvin* and *Chemintius* ſay, here is meant, whatever is brought into Religion without the Word. Now it is manifeſt, that a Frame of Divine Service, not warranted in the word, falleth under this general head. 2. The Lord condemneth all Worſhip offered up to him, that he hath not commanded, *Jer.* 7. 31. where not being commanded, but deviſed by Men, is made the Ground on which that practice (though otherwiſe evil alſo) is condemned. And *Jeroboam*'s Frame and way of Service is condemned, becauſe *deviſed* (*Heb.* created) *of his own Heart*, 1 King. 12. 33. 3. Even Reaſon teacheth, that God ought to chuſe how He will be Honoured, or Worſhipped by his Creatures. He beſt knoweth what will pleaſe him; and His Soveraignty in all things muſt eſpecially appear in this, that Himſelf is ſo nearly concerned in. This is a Principle ſo rooted in Nature, that among the Heathens, they that contrived their Liturgies, or ways of Worſhip, behoved to pretend Revelation from their Gods, to guide them in this. It was never heard of among the more religious *Heathens*, that Religion, or the manner of worſhipping their Gods, was injoined only by mans Authority, and deviſed only by him. Yea, in the ſo much magnified *Rozary of the Virgin Mary*; it is alledged, that St. *Dominicus* had it revealed by the Virgin her ſelf, that this form of Service was moſt acceptable to her; and it is added, That *ſhe was fitteſt to chuſe what way ſhe would be Worſhipped*: I hope they, and ſuch as Symbolize with them, in ordering of the Worſhip of God, will give us leave to ſay the ſame of her Bleſſed Son. 4. For the matter of Worſhip, I think it will not be queſtioned, whether that muſt be appointed by God or not; otherwiſe the five Popiſh Sacraments, that they have added to Chriſts two, could not be condemned; and men might make any kind of Action, as Dancing, Walking, Leaping, to be religious worſhip. And even the Frame, Compoſure, or mode of Divine Worſhip ſhould have Divine Warrant; otherwiſe it is not Acceptable to God. The Lord hath appointed in his Houſe, as Acts of his Worſhip, Reading Scripture, Preaching, Praying, Praiſing, Baptiſm, and the Lords Supper; and the Service that we offer up to him in our Aſſemblies, ſhould be

an orderly performance of these. But when Men devise a Frame of Service, which is none of these, distinctly and orderly performed; but all of them confusedly jumbled together, and some modes of their own added to them. This Mode or Frame of divine worship the Lord hath not warranted; there is no example of it in Scripture, nor in the purest and first times of the Gospel; and therefore we ought not to worship God in such a manner. I hope it will not be asserted by our Brethren, that it is in the power of the *Church* to cast the divine Offices (as they speak) into what Frame or Mould they will; to make it look like a Theatrical Show, if they like that way, and think some carnal minds will be taken with it; and if this be granted; then it followeth, that there may be a Frame of Worship unlawful as to the manner of it; which it may be a Sin for people to join in. I do not say, that the order of religious Acts in the publick Assemblies is fixed; so as we may not begin either with a Psalm or Prayer, or Exhortation, *&c.* but there is an order to be observed; and there may be a sinful swerving from it, which we are obliged to shun.

Sect. 9. The last thing to be proved, is, That the *Liturgy* now under debate is unwarranted; and that it is unlawful to join in worshipping God by it: For this I bring five Reasons, 1. The Ordinance of God for reading the word in the Assembles of his people, is by this Service much perverted; for the Scripture is read in a very corrupt Translation; following the *vulgar Latin* Translation, as the *Papists* do, as may be shewed in many instances, where the Sense of the Hebrew or Greek Text, is either contradicted, or distorted Additions are made to the Scripture; as the *5th. 6th.* and *7th. verses* of *Psal.* 14. are not in the Hebrew. Many Chapters of the Bible are never read in the *Church* at all; and instead of them, humane Writings: Yea, which contain fabulous things, as *Ecclesiasticus* 44. *Judith* 9. *Tobit* 5. much more also of *Apocripha* is read as the Word of God. Yea, with justling out the Word of God. This we judge a depraving of God's Ordinance. These *Apocriphical* writings, tho they be not said to be divine Scripture; yet they are so placed with it, and in its stead, and no hint given of their humane Original; that the people cannot but look on them as Scripture; yea, wise men have ground to judge that they were so look'd on by the first contrivers of that Frame of Service, I mean the *Papists*. Some Scriptures are so read, as the reading of them with express reference to such occasion, as

they

they are in the Book, appropriate to, is an abuſing and miſ-applying of them; as on the Feſtivity of *Michael* the *Archangel*, is read, *Rev.* 12. 7. as if *Michael* that fought with the Dragon, were not Chriſt, but a created Angel. 2. It hath a great and ſcandalous appearance of ſuperſtition; if ſuperſtition it ſelf can be ſeparated from its uſe, in appropriating Scriptures to be read, to days, not only ordinary days, but ſuch as they without warrant have ſeparated from other days, and made Holy, and reſtraining Miniſters from reading ſuch portions of Scripture to the people, as ſuit the preſent caſe of them, or of the *Church*, alſo the appointing one piece to be ſaid in the Desk, another at the Altar; one with the Miniſters Face to the people, another with his Face to the Eaſt, and his Back toward the People; the many changes of poſtures, ſitting, ſtanding, kneeling, bowing, *&c.* we cannot perſwade our ſelves, that ſuch a Mode of worſhip is appointed by Chriſt, Was ever practiſed in the purer times of the *Church*, or is acceptable to God.

Sect. 10. The Frame or Compoſure of it is unwarranted, unprecedented in Scripture, and the purer Antiquity, and unſuitable to ſo holy an Action, as is Goſpel Worſhip; as appeareth, in the jumbling of Prayer, and reading Scripture together; ſo many ſhort Collects, two or three Lines, and then reading; then another ſcrape of Prayer, and then of Scripture; alſo the *Reſponds*, toſſing the Service between Miniſter and People, and the Clerk and Miniſter; the mutual Salutations; the *Letany*, of Hetheniſh Original; like *O Baal hear us*, reiterated ſo often; and other repeating of the ſame things ſo often, as is nauſeous to ſerious worſhippers of God: We dare not worſhip God in a way that is ſo unlike to any worſhip, that we read of among his people; and that is ſo *Theatrical* and *Pompous*. 4. Several paſſages in it are not ſound; others have a great appearance of unſoundneſs; and others are unwarrantable. There is a Prayer, *that We with this our Brother* (the Man to be Buried) *and all our Brethren departed, may have perfect Conſummation*: Where the Dead are prayed for; and it is ſuppoſed that every one that dyeth is Saved: The words have that appearance; they pray to be kept from all deadly Sin. It hath an hew at leaſt, of approving the diſtinction of *Mortal* and *Venial* Sins: They pray to be delivered from ſeveral dangers and Afflictions, which there is no more reaſon to mention in Prayer, than there is of other things that are ordinary.

Sect.

Sect. 11. 5. It is a Symbolizing with *Idolaters*, in our manner of worſhipping God, which the Scripture condemneth, *Deut.* 12. 30, 31. I hope it will not be denyed by our Brethren, that the *Papiſts* are *Idolaters*; and that this Service is a Symbolizing with them, is too evident, which may appear, 1. If we conſider the Manner and Frame of this Service, and compare it with the *Maſs*: It is true, they differ in that this is in *Engliſh*, that in *Latin*; and that ſome parts of the *Maſs* are left out; but otherwiſe they are as like to one another, as one thing can be to another; and this was not denyed by our Reformers, who profeſſed that their deſign in retaining this *Service*, was to bring *Papiſts* to the *Church* (tho' it proved, after a while, rather a mean of carrying *Proteſtants* to the *Maſs*.) And King *Edward 6th.* with the Council, did affirm as much in a Letter to the Rebels in the *Weſt*, who had riſen in defence of *Popery*; ſaying, that the Service that now they had in *Engliſh*, was almoſt the ſame that before they had in *Latin*. And any that readeth the Bible, and the *Maſs*, and this *Service*, may eaſily ſee that there is a far greater Simitude between it and the *Maſs*, than between it and all the Worſhip of God, that the Scripture giveth account of, to have been practiced in the Apoſtolick *Church*. 2. This may appear, if we conſider the Original of this *Service*; it was taken out of ſeveral *Popiſh* Books; the Prayers out of the *Breviary*, the Sacraments, Burial, Matrimony, Viſitation of the Sick, out of the *Ritual*: Adminſtration of the Lords Supper, out of the *Maſs-book*; and Conſecration of Biſhops, out of the *Pontifical*; as any may ſee, who will be at the pains to compare the Books mentioned together.

Sect. 12. I know it will be ſaid, that they retain only thoſe parts of thoſe Books, that were compoſed by the Orthodox Fathers of the *Church*, and uſed in the primitive times. But this is no ſufficient defence; for, 1. Suppoſe that Frame of worſhip had ſo good an Original; yet being now of late ſo groſly abuſed to *Idolatry*, and being ſo like to the *Idolatrous* worſhip of the *Papiſts*, rather than like Apoſtolick Worſhip; and we having departed from that *Church* on good Grounds, why ſhould we chuſe their way of worſhip, and in ſo doing, both differ from the primitive times, eſpecially the Apoſtles times, and from all other *Reformed Churches*? 2. It is falſe, that this Frame of *Service* was compoſed by the Fathers; it is indeed ſaid by ſome, that *Jerom* compoſed ſome Prayers

ers for the uſe of weak Chriſtians; but that he, or any other ſuch, did compoſe this Frame, or any thing like it, is denyed; and I have proved, that there was no ſuch thing in theſe Times. The Prayers were made by *Gregory* the Great, *Anno* 600. or thereabout, other parts were added by other *Popes*; the Reſponds came not in till many years after. What is commonly talked of the *Liturgies* of the Apoſtles or Evangeliſts, *James*, *Peter*, *Matthew*, *Mark*, is now ſo exploded, as learned men among our Brethren, do not plead for them. This ſhall ſuffice concerning the *Liturgy*, about which more might have been ſaid; but I have ſaid more than at firſt I intended.

SECT

SECT. VIII.

The other Terms of Communion that they impoſe, conſidered.

I proceed now to attend the Learned Dr's Diſcourſe, about theſe other Terms of *Communion*, that his *Church* impoſeth, and we ſcruple: And firſt I take notice, that he chargeth his Anſwerers with remaining in Generals, and pretending that *they judge, they eſteem*, the *Terms of Communion* unlawful; but bring no particular Arguments to prove the unlawfulneſs of them. He ſaith, *Proteſtants* do not do ſo when they charge the *Church of Rome* with unlawful *Terms of Communion*. The Anſwer to this is eaſie, 1. They were charged with *Separation*, and in anſwering the Dr's Sermon, acted the part of Defendants; it was enough for that defence, to plead that they did not *Separate* without good Ground, and to ſhew that they ſcrupled ſuch and ſuch *Terms of Communion*, impoſed on them by the *Church*. It was not needful in this debate to reſume all the Controverſie about the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*. 2. Our Party have given abundant proof of the reaſonableneſs of their ſcrupling at theſe things; the Books above mentioned againſt the *Liturgy*, and againſt the *Ceremonies*; *Didoclavius*, the Author of the Book, called the *Engliſh Popiſh Ceremonies*; Mr. *Jeans Treaſure out of Rubiſh*, *a Treatiſe of Divine Worſhip*: *Engliſh Puritaniſm*. *Twelve Arguments againſt Ceremonies*: *Smectymn*. *G. F. queſtions betwixt Conformiſts and Non-conformiſts*, and many other pieces. There is ſo much ſaid in theſe, and yet unanſwered, that it was needleſs to repeat what is there ſaid. I muſt be guilty of the ſame fault, if it be one; having at length diſputed againſt the *Ceremonies*, and proved them to be unlawful to be uſed, in a Piece entituled, *A Vindication of the Purity of Goſpel Worſhip*, *againſt Mr. George Ritchel*, *and others*. I may without blame referr the Reader thither and not repeat what is there written; provided I leave nothing unanſwered, that the Dr. hath here ſaid on that Subject. 3. Our Party do not ſtand on equal Ground with the Dr. and his Party: Neither have we the liberty of the Preſs as they have, nor that immunity to ſpeak out our Arguments; but we are ready to be concluded, by a Priſon, inſtead of Arguments; but let not the Dr. think our Cauſe is laid low, becauſe our Perſons, and worldly Intereſts are ſo.

Sect. 2. He reſumeth an Argument (out of his Sermon) againſt our *Separating*; that there ought to be no *Separation*, where there is agreement in Doctrine and Subſtantial parts of Worſhip; and that this Agreement is acknowledged in our caſe. He ſaith Mr. *A.* denyeth ſuch Agreement both in Doctrine (of this I have given my judgment above, *Part* 2. *S.* 1, *Section*, 2. alſo in Subſtantial parts of Worſhip, and alledged the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, to be a Subſtantial part of Worſhip: Hence the *Dr.* undertaketh, *p.* 335. 1. To ſhew what he meaneth by Subſtantial parts of Worſhip. 2. That the *Croſs* is not made ſuch. The *Dr.* ſeemeth to lay ſome weight on this diſtinction of parts of Worſhip, to wit; *Subſtantial* and *Circumſtantial*, or *Accidental*; and alledgeth that many of us are miſled, by not conſidering it. I much deſire the clearing of it, and therefore reſolve carefully to obſerve what he ſaith, and ſhall be ready to receive Light. He ſaith, that, *The Nonconformiſts great Principle is, That what ever was any ways intended or deſigned for the Worſhip of God, was a Real and Subſtantial part of his Worſhip; and when their Adverſaries told them, that Divine Inſtitution was needful to make a part of Worſhip; they ſaid, that made True Worſhip, but without it an Act might be Worſhip, that is, Falſe Worſhip; and yet they allow'd the Application of common Circumſtances to Acts of Worſhip.* This Subject I have diſcourſed at large, in the Book above cited, *cap.* 3. *ſect.* 1, 3, 4. But ſhall now a little conſider, what repreſentation the *Dr.* is pleaſed to make of our Principles. 1. I know no *Nonconformiſt* that ever aſſerted that all that was intended or deſigned for Worſhip, was Worſhip, either Real or Subſtantial; for they well know, that the Meeting-place, the Miniſters Maintenance, the Pulpit, Communion-Table, *&c.* are deſigned for Worſhip, and yet are no Worſhip, Real nor Imaginary, Subſtantial nor Accidental, True nor Falſe. If he mean by being deſigned for Worſhip, that the perſon doing ſuch an Act, intendeth to Worſhip God by ſo doing (which I cannot take to be his meaning); I hope himſelf will acknowledg that though ſuch a deſign is needful to make an act of Worſhip acceptable; yet Worſhip may be without it, elſe the three Children might have fallen down before the Image, keeping their intention to themſelves, without the guilt of the external act of *Idolatry*.

Sect. 3. I obſerve here, 2. That the *Dr.* confoundeth his own diſtinction, by jumbling together the terms of *Real* and *Subſtantial*

Worſhip: To *real* Worſhip, muſt be oppoſed that which is no Worſhip, or but ſuch in imagination: To *ſubſtantial* Worſhip, muſt be oppoſed that which is *circumſtantial*, or *accidental* Worſhip. This is as if we ſhould diſtinguiſh *Ens in ſubſtantiam, & accidens*; and ſpeaking of the firſt Member of the Diviſion, call it, *ſubſtantiam*, or *ens realc*, which comprehendeth both *ſubſtantia* and *accidens*. Let the *Dr.* then tell us plainly, whether by *ſubſtantial* Worſhip, he mean all that is *really* Worſhip, or is truly Worſhip, *Veritate Metaphyſica*, though it be not ſo, *Veritate Theologica*. And if this be his Meaning, what needed ſuch a diſtinction of Worſhip? Had it not been as eaſie to deny the Ceremonies, in debate, to be Worſhip, or any part of Worſhip, as others of his Party do? What needed he blame the *Non-conformiſts* for want of Clearneſs and Diſtinction in this matter, when himſelf hath confounded it? I ſee no uſe of this his clear Notion, but to confound the debate, and hide the nakedneſs of his Cauſe. We ſay, the *Ceremonies* are parts of Worſhip, though falſe Worſhip; others of his Party ſay, they are no Worſhip, but meer Circumſtances of Worſhip: The *Dr.* will clear the Matter, by telling us, That they are accidental Worſhip, but not *real* nor *ſubſtantial* Worſhip: Let any, that hath a cleer ſight, judge, whether this be a clearing or a confounding of this Matter.

Sect. 4. The *Dr.* will now (*p.* 336.) *ſeriouſly conſider this Matter; becauſe he deſigneth not to confute, but to convince the* Non-conformiſts; and his work for this end, is, *To find out a plain diſcernable Difference between ſubſtantial parts of Divine Worſhip, and meer accidental Appendices; and this*, he ſaith, *may more diſintangle ſcrupulous Minds, than the multiplying of Arguments, to prove the Lawfulneſs of our Ceremonies*. I doubt not of the *Doctor*'s good deſign, in this debate, but he is not very like to attain it by ſuch Methods, as is this propoſing a diſtinction to clear the Subject in diſpute, and then confound the Terms; and then at laſt, as he doth here, to over-turn it wholly; for here he calleth the *Ceremonies*, meer *accidental Appendices* of Worſhip; that is, no Worſhip, nor parts of Worſhip at all. But let him call them what he will, we ſtrive not about Names; we maintain, that they are parts of Worſhip, (but parts of falſe Worſhip) and in ſuch a Religious State, as nothing but the Inſtitutions of *Chriſt* can lawfully have; in that they are uſed in *Religion appropriated* to it, deſigned for the *Honouring of* GOD by them, for the bettering of Religious Actions, and for

the

the Religious end of edifying the Souls of them that uſe them: Theſe Qualities are in the *Ceremonies*; and if theſe conjoined, do not make an Action to be Religious, and a part of Worſhip, (they belonging to no other part of Religion) I know not what can make a thing to be an Act of Worſhip; for to ſay, that nothing can be a Religious Act, but what hath Divine Inſtitution, is to deny, that there can be ſuch a thing as an *external* Act of *Idolatry*, or *Superſtition*.

Sect. 5. In purſuance of this Enquiry, and to find out this plain and diſcernable difference between *ſubſtantial* parts of Worſhip, and *accidental Appendices* of it: The *Dr.* bringeth ſeveral things agreed on both ſides; they are five in number; I ſhall not repeat them, nor except againſt them, ſave that I wiſh he had ſhewed in the Second of them, how theſe things under the Law, that by divine Inſtitution, became parts of Worſhip, were of themſelves *Ritual*, and *Ceremonial*: I rather think that without divine Appointment, it was unlawful to uſe them as *Rites* or *Ceremonies* in *Gods* Worſhip. He cometh now, *Sect.* 27. *To find out the Marks of Diſtinction, to ſatisfie the Conſcience of the Difference between Innocent Ceremonies, and ſuperſtitious parts of Divine Worſhip.* Here is yet another Face of our *Proteus*-like diſtinction, but I wave that, finding that the *Dr.* cannot make it appear, that there is any part of Worſhip that is not *ſubſtantial* and *real* Worſhip; and that all that is a part of Worſhip, is, even by him, looked on as *ſuperſtitious*, if it be not appointed by divine Authority: For his Notion of *Innocent Ceremonies*, I apprehend not his Meaning by this Term, *Accidental Appendices* of Worſhip he calleth them before, which alſo needeth a Commentary. If he mean natural Circumſtances, I know theſe may be very innocent, and yet not inſtituted: But a *Ceremony* (as I have ſhewed in the before cited *Vindic. of Purit. C.* 3. *Sect.* 3.) is properly a thing in *Statu Religioſo*, or appropriate to Religion, but no natural part of Worſhip; and therefore I ſee not how it can be innocent, unleſs inſtituted: For *accidental Appendices* of Worſhip, if they be any thing beyond natural and neceſſary Circumſtances determined by natural or civil Cuſtome, I ſee not how theſe either can be innocent, unleſs inſtituted. I humbly conceive, the *Dr.* hath hitherto brought little light into this Controverſie, but rather Darkneſs and Confuſion.

Sect. 6. Seeing we cannot agree about theſe Notions, let us labour, if we can, to concert the thing. He telleth us of Two ways,

by which Ceremonies may become parts of Worſhip; 1. *By ſuppoſing them to be neceſſary, and pleaſing to GOD, without a humane Law impoſing them.* 2. *By ſuppoſing them unalterable.* We need not debate with the *Dr.* whether things become parts of Worſhip, and ſo ſuperſtitious, when not inſtituted by theſe two ways or not: But all this Diſcourſe is wide from the purpoſe, unleſs he make it appear, that no uninſtituted thing can be a part of Worſhip, nor ſuperſtitious, but by one of theſe Two Means: Or if we can make it appear, that without both theſe Opinions of men, about the Things that they uſe in Worſhip, without Inſtitution, they may be guilty of falſe Worſhip, or Superſtition; which I here do briefly, becauſe I have done it ſufficiently, in the place cited againſt Mr. *Ritſhell*, who objected the ſame thing, in defence of the *Ceremonies*, that the *Dr.* now doth. 1. If this were true, there could be no external Act of falſe Worſhip, without an Erroneous Opinion of the Mind; but that is abſurd, for then a man, who, to ſhun Perſecution, ſhould fall down before an *Idol*, and in Words and Geſtures, do all that *Idolaters* do, ſhould not be guilty of the outward Act of *Idolatry*; yea, it would follow, that is, the *Church* ſhould erect a Statue, and impoſe it as a neceſſary *Term of Communion* with her, that her Members ſhould once a week kneel before that Statue, and pray to *GOD*, and then kiſs that Statue, with a reverend Bow, when, mean while, the *Church* declareth that this is not commanded out of an Opinion that ſuch kneeling, *&c.* is antecedently pleaſing to *GOD*; nor that this their Command is unalterable, nor binding to all; nor that the things commanded, are unalterable, and ſo binding; but only the Church judgeth this decent and fit to adorn the other parts of Worſhip: I ſay in this caſe, this bowing, ſhould be an innocent *Ceremony*, and no Act of falſe Worſhip; which, I think, will hardly go down with the greateſt *Ceremony*-Mongers: And, in a word, let us but receive this one Principle, that there is no falſe Worſhip without ſuch Opinion, as he mentioneth; and men may do what they will, and the *Church* impoſe what ſhe will, in the Worſhip of *GOD*, provided they keep a right Opinion about the nature of theſe things; ſo that it is no more our concern to look to Scripture, that we may learn how to order the external Worſhip of *GOD*, but to look to our Opinion, that it be not faulty: And by this means, there are few of the *Ceremonies* that ever *Papiſts*, or *Heathens* uſed, but a *Church* found in the Faith, and in opinion about Superſtition, might

might bring them into the Worſhip of *GOD*, which is to open the door for *Ceremonial Worſhip* a little too wide, in the opinion of moſt ſound Divines.

Sect. 7. Another Exception I make againſt the *Dr.* Two ways, how an Act becometh ſuperſtitious, is, Let them (eſpecially the firſt of them) be applyed to our *Ceremonies*, and I doubt not, but even what himſelf hath ſaid, might condemn them; for however the pliable People that uſe the *Ceremonies*, becauſe commanded by the *Church*, and ſee no antecedent neceſſity, or goodneſs in them, may by this means be acquitted from Superſtition; the *Church* that impoſeth them, cannot be ſo innocent; for either the *Church* muſt have reaſon for this Impoſition, or none, but, *ſic volo, ſic jubeo, ſit pro ratione Voluntas.* The Latter, I hope, the *Dr.* will not ſay, leſt by purging his *Church* of Superſtition, he make her guilty of as great a Crime; *to wit*, being Lords over *GOD*'s Heritage, and *Church-Tyrants*. If he ſay the Former, this Reaſon muſt be, that theſe things are needful, that they pleaſe *GOD*: No, ſay our Adverſaries, the *Churches* Reaſon for impoſing them, is, She thinketh them decent, and edifying: But doth ſhe not think this *Decency*, and that *Edification* that is by them, to be antecedently pleaſing to *GOD*, and needful for the *Church?* If ſhe do not, ſhe acteth by meer will; if ſhe do, ſhe is guilty of a ſuperſtitious opinion, in ſuppoſing uninſtituted things in VVorſhip, to be pleaſing to *GOD*, antecedentally to a humane Law; for if the uſe of them be pleaſing to *God*, ſo muſt the things, out of which that uſefulneſs doth reſult. And indeed, it may abundantly appear, to the Conviction of all unbyaſſed Men, what opinion of the neceſſity of theſe *Ceremonies* our Biſhops have, when they appoint them by their Canons, impoſe them with Rigour and Severity, puniſh the Neglect of them with ſuch Violence; and when they force them upon the Conſciences of them, who agree with themſelves in all things elſe; and when they make ſuch diſtractions and diviſions in the *Church*, rather than lay aſide theſe things. Can any man of common ſenſe, whoſe reaſon is not fetter'd by Prejudice and Intereſt, judge, that men who act ſo, have no opinion of the antecedent Goodneſs of the *Ceremonies*, or that they do not think them pleaſing to *God?* He that thinketh otherwiſe, can think what he will.

Sect. 8. I come now to examine what the *Dr.* ſaith in defence of theſe Two things, which he requireth to make an uncommanded Act in Wor-

Worſhip to be ſuperſtitious. The 1ſt. is, *That it be ſuppoſed to be neceſſary and pleaſing to God, and the omiſſion of it unpleaſing to God, antecedently to a humane Law.* All the proof that he bringeth of what he ſaith, is, that *the Obſervations that Chriſt condemned in the* Phariſees, *had no other evil in them, nor were condemned on any other account, but becauſe of this Opinion that they had about them,* (*as* Grocius *obſerveth*) *that Touching any thing unclean, by Law, did communicate uncleanneſs to Soul and Body, and that Waſhing did cleanſe both; on which ſuppoſition, they thought this Waſhing pleaſing to God.* Three things I here reply, before I come to anſwer the *Drs.* Proofs of this his Allegation. 1. All this is nothing to our purpoſe, unleſs it can be made appear that Chriſt condemneth only their erroneous Opinion, and not their Practiſe; or that they might Lawfully have added theſe Religious obſervations, to theſe that the Lord had appointed in his Law, provided they had no opinon of the antecedent neceſſity of the things which is ſo far from being proved, that the Contrary is evident, for our Lord doth expreſly Condemn the obſerving of theſe things *Mark*, 7. 8. *Ye hold the Tradition of men, as the Waſhing of Pots and Cups, and many other ſuch things do ye.* Their *Doing*, not their *Thinking* only, is condemned; Will any man ſay, that if any of the *Phariſees* ſhould have laid aſide that Opinion that the *Dr.* imputeth to them, and look'd on theſe obſervations, as of no neceſſity, antecedent to the *Tradition* of the Elders; and yet obſerved them Carefully and Religiouſly, that ſuch a one had ſufficiently complyed with Chriſt's Doctrine? no, ſurely, for the Controverſy between the *Diſciples* and *Phariſees*, was not about Thinking, but about Doing; the Diſciples not only were not of their Opinion, but abſtained from their Practice.

Sect. 9. It is evident from *Galat.* 4. 9, 10. that the Apoſtle condemneth the obſervation of the old Jewiſh *Ceremonies*, though it is clear, that he is mainly diſputeing againſt their opinion of Juſtification by works, and theſe among other works; yet this doth not hinder the practice of theſe, abſtracted from that opinion to be evil, it being expreſly condemned; wherefore it is not enough that our practice, in Gods Worſhip, be not built on a bad opinion; but it ſelf muſt have warrant from God. 2. Chriſt in that debate is mainly dealing with the Impoſers of theſe *Ceremonies*, the *Phariſees*, who continued that Yoak on the People, that their Anceſtors had laid on them; and therefore it is no wonder that he took notice of a perverſe opinion in them, which moved them ſo to impoſe on the People, whereas the people that obeyed, might be moved only by the authority of their Guides; hence

he

he calleth them *their Traditions*, becauſe they continued them, and put new life in them, by their Authority. The parallel then ſtill holdeth between our Caſe and theirs, as they behoved to have ſome undue eſteem of theſe waſhings that made them Impoſe them with the ſame (yea more) Zeal than that with which they enjoyned the Ordinances of God; ſo there muſt be in our *Church*-Guides, ſome apprehenſion of Good in the *Ceremonies* more than is meet, that maketh them not only intermix them with Divine Worſhip, but impoſe them with equal (if not ſuperiour) Zeal, with the Ordinances of God. 3. Any variation of their opinion about their Waſhings, from our opinion about our *Ceremonies*, that can be obſerved, ariſeth from the difference that is between their *Church* and Ordinances, and ours; and ſo cannot make their impoſition unlawful, if ours be lawful; for God had appointed Waſhings, for removing of *Ceremonial* uncleanneſs, which affected both Soul and Body; *to wit*, at the touching of the Dead, or any unclean thing; and all the *Jews* knew, that antecedently to the Command, no uncleanneſs could be contracted by theſe Touches, nor removed by theſe Waſhings. The *Rabbies*, in the Apoſtate State of that *Church*, added ſuch like obſervations to Gods, out of a deſire of more ample ſtrictneſs, and that their purity might be more conſpicuous; knowing well, that before the Command, theſe things were in the ſame ſtate, that the other things were in, before God's Command. Juſt ſo doth our *Church*; God hath inſtituted ſome *Ceremonies* for his own Honour, and Edification of his People; ſo as we all know, that antecedently to his command, they were indifferent things, as Water, Bread, and Wine; and the *Church* not content with theſe, add ſome other *Ceremonies*, for further honouring of God; *to wit*, making his Worſhip more decent, and further edification, ſtirring up the dull minds of men; yet proteſting, that antecedently to their command, theſe things are indifferent. Is not here an exact parallel; if it be ſaid, that the *Rabbies* thought the things that they enjoyned, to be comprehended under God's commanded Worſhip, before they enjoyned them; this is denyed, and the contrary is evident, from Chriſt's Reaſoning with them; he all along maketh a diſtinction between *God's Command*, and their *Tradition*: which they might eaſily have objected againſt, if they had pretended a Command of God, for the things that they by Tradition impoſed.

Sect. 10.

Sect. 10. In order to the proving his Opinion in this matter, he ſaith, *p.* 339. that, *the Reaſon of Chriſt's oppoſing the* Phariſees *was, not becauſe a thing in it ſelf unneceſſary was determined by their Superiors, but becauſe of the ſuperſtitious opinion that the* Phariſees *had about theſe Waſhings.* Here is a wrong ſtate of the Queſtion hinted; we never quarrelled with ſuperiours for determining a thing in it ſelf unneceſſary; we know they may determine this Time, and that Place of Worſhip, and yet neither of theſe in it ſelf is neceſſary, ſeeing another time or place may do as well. But the Queſtion is, whether Superiors may determine a thing, that is not at all needful to be determined? as the Habit, Geſture, *&c.* and appropriate this their determination to Religious Worſhip, that ſo it ſhall be done in Worſhip, though it be not ſo done in other Actions; and this without warrant from the Lord, whom we Worſhip. His Proofs, that the *Phariſees* were condemned only becauſe of their ſuperſtitious opinion (and if this *only* be not underſtood by the *Dr.* he ſpeaketh not to the point in hand) are two. [illegible] *From the force of our Saviour's Reaſoning:* Thus then he argue[illegible] *p.* 340. *He proveth that they ſet up their Tradition above the Law of God; as in the Vow Corban.* (*The force of which Argument extendeth to all that they obſerved, becauſe of the Tradition of their Anceſtors*) *therefore they thought theſe things pleaſing to God, and that mens Conſciences were ſtrictly obliged to obſerve them.* This is the ſum of the *Drs.* Argument. To which the Anſwer is obvious; *to wit*, that this doth not at all prove, that the *Phariſees* thought theſe things obliging, antecedently to their *Tradition*, which is the only thing in Queſtion; Chriſt's Reaſoning proveth no more, but that they had an undue eſteem of their own Authority, and did (upon the matter) equal it with, if not prefer it, to that of God; by laying ſuch ſtreſs on things that ſtood meerly on their Authority; but he doth not ſo much as hint, that they thought theſe things antecedently obligeing, or that the omitting of them would have defiled the Conſcience, though there had been no ſuch *Tradition.* Is not our Caſe parallel to theirs in this? VVe ſay, the *Ceremonies* oblige not, there is no Sin in not obſerving them, nor Indecency in not uſing them, antecedently to the Law; ſo did the *Phariſees* of their Waſhings; and if they were Zealous for their Waſhings, are not ye ſo, to as great a degree, for your *Ceremonies* when impoſed? what diſobedience, ungovernableneſs, contempt of the Worſhip of God, and indecency in it, are we charged with? and

we

we are profecuted with more rigour for neglect of theſe, than others are for the higheſt Immoralities. Is not this to prefer your *Tradition* to God's Law? Do not ye make void the Law of God, neglecting Love, ſtudying Unity, Mercy, *&c.* for theſe your *Traditions*?

Sect. 11. But ſaith the *Dr. The Phariſees thought a mans Conſcience defiled, if he did not obſerve the* Traditions, *as appears by Chriſt's ſubſequent Diſcourſe, ſhewing what it is that defileth a man, and what not.* *A.* This they thought, only becauſe they had put theſe things in that ſtate, by their *Tradition*, but never taught that theſe things would have defiled the man if there had been no ſuch *Tradition*; and do not our Brethren think, that omitting the *Ceremonies* now injoyned, defileth a man? Do they not think the *Non-conformiſts* have need of Repentance and Pardon for their *Non-conformity*: If they think not ſo, why do they ſo blame, and proſecute them? The *Dr.* concludeth, *p.* 341. That the main thing in queſtion, was, whether this *Ceremony* of waſhing hands, could be omitted without defileing the Conſcience, otherwiſe, ſaith he, our Saviour's Concluſion *doth not reach the Queſtion.* This is a great Miſtake (though it were no hazard to our Cauſe to grant it) for this Queſtion was but conſequential to another; *to wit*, Whether the *Church* had power to inſtitute *Ceremonies*, ſuch as Chriſt had not inſtituted; and then charge People with ſin, and not keeping a good Conſcience, for not obſerving them: This was the main Queſtion, as appeareth by his reproving them for making ſuch *Traditions*, and for bringing the Commandments of men into God's Worſhip: Our Saviours Concluſion that he ſpeaketh of; *to wit*, his diſcourſe about what defileth a man, is not the thing he firſt intended to prove; *to wit*, by his reproving them for their *Traditions*; for the Concluſion of that Argument, is, *That men ought not to teach for Doctrines, the Commandments of men*, i. e. inſtitute in Worſhip, what Chriſt hath not inſtituted; But this diſcourſe, about what defileth a man, is a Conſequence drawn from that Concluſion; *to wit*, That things, ſo forbidden, may be forborn without ſin; and that it is tranſgreſſing of God's Command, not of mans, that defileth the Conſcience; wherefore there is no ground for what the *Dr.* ſaith, that Chriſt condemned them, not meerly with reſpect to the Command of Superiours, (underſtand a Command of Superiours bringing into the Worſhip of God, what was not inſtituted by God; otherwiſe, it reacheth not our Queſtion) for condemning the *Traditions* of

men, is a condemning meerly with reſpect to the Command of Superiors, in that ſenſe.

Sect. 12. This next Proof is *from the general ſenſe of the* Jews, *p.* 342. *for this he ſheweth, That Mr.* A. *himſelf quoteth ſeveral Paſſages of the* Talmudiſts, *to prove, That they equalled their* Traditions, *with the Commands of God; and hence inferreth, that this was not look't on as an indifferent* Ceremony, *but as a thing, whoſe omiſſion brought guilt on the Conſcience.* The former Anſwer doth fully take away the force of all that he here diſcourſeth; *to wit*, the *Jews* thought the Conſcience defiled by ſuch omiſſion, after the thing was impoſed by the Authority of the *Church*, not before; ſo our *Prelatiſts* in reference to the *Ceremonies*. Wherefore, Mr. *A. is far from overturning all the reſt of his Diſcourſe, by this one ſaying*, as the *Dr.* alleadgeth. I well know, what Sanctity the *Rabbies* placed in the ſtrict Obſervance of theſe things, and therefore I contradict none of his Citations out of them: But all this Sanctity they founded, not only natural, or antecedent goodneſs of the things obſerved, but on the great duty of Obedience to the Orders of the *Church*, in which our Brethren are not much inferiour to them. He telleth us, that they ſaid, *Whoſoever diſeſteemeth this Cuſtom, deſerveth not only Excommunication, but Death too:* and what leſs do the *Prelatiſts* ſay of omitting the *Ceremonies*, except that it is not yet made death by the Law; though the cruel uſage that many have met with on this account, hath brought them to their death. I could tell you of *Rabbies* in the *Church* of *England*, that talk as high againſt not obſerving the *Ceremonies*, as ever the *Jewiſh Rabbies* did againſt not obſerving their Waſhings. He admireth, *p.* 344. That Mr. *A.* would make People believe, that this was no more but an indifferent *Ceremony* among the *Jews*, and required for Order and Decency, as our *Ceremonies* are. *A.* He need not admire, for none of us ſay ſo of that Waſhing, when impoſed; and he cannot prove that it was any other but indifferent to them before impoſition, as our *Ceremonies* are. That waſhing was not impoſed for Order and Decency, as our *Ceremonies* are; a Reaſon of the difference is already given; *to wit*, That it was an addition to Chriſt's *Ceremonies*, for taking away Uncleanneſs: Ours are an addition to Chriſt's Inſtitution, for honouring Him, and edifying of Souls.

Sect. 13. He proceedeth, *Sect.* 28. to enlarge and enforce this Truth, by conſidering the *Popiſh Ceremonies*, and their opinion of waſhing away Sin, and Juſtification by them. And for this, he citeth

citeth many Authors, all which pains might have been ſpared: For this Argument doth not at all differ from what he hath ſaid about the *Jews* opinion of their Waſhings, and needeth no other Anſwer. All the Efficacy that *Papiſts* attribute to their *Ceremonies*, is conſequent to, and dependent on, their being injoyned by the *Church*: None of them ſay, that they have ſuch Efficacy in themſelves, and that they attribute, taking away of ſin, to them, ariſeth from the opinion they have of the Merit of good Works, which the *Church* of *England* doth not maintain. The *Church* of *England* maketh them good Works, but denieth their Merit; becauſe ſhe denieth that, even to the Works that God hath commanded: The *Papiſts* do but make them good Works alſo, and that they think them meritorious, is from this their opinion, that all good Works are ſuch, and not from an opinion that they can do ſuch Feats by any power in themſelves, without Inſtitution. *They aſcribe ſpiritual Effects to them*, ſaith he; ſo do you to your *Ceremonies*; as, *ſtirring up of dull Minds, engaging the Soul to God*, &c. I think the *Croſs* hath no more Efficacy for this, without a Divine Inſtitution, than it has to drive away Devils, as the *Papiſts* alledge *Ameſius* ought not to have been charged with diſingenuity, by the *Doctor*, on this ground. He doth not equal the Evil of the *Engliſh Ceremonies*, with theſe of *Rome*, but that this *Church* hath no more power to make them Religious Rites, than that hath to make them Cauſes of Grace. He telleth us, *pag.* 346. That our *Church* receiveth them no otherwiſe, than as purged from *Popiſh Superſtition*; and for this, citeth *Præf.* to *Common-Prayer*, and *Can.* 30. *Anſwer.* Neither the *Dr.* nor his *Church* will be condemned, if they may be their own Judges; it is *Amicum Teſtimonium.* I confeſs they have purged out much *Popiſh Superſtition* out of them, but to purge out all, is impoſſible: The things themſelves, as ſtated in the Worſhip of God, without His Inſtitution, being ſuch: Whatever the *Dr.* hath gained to his Cauſe, by this Diſcourſe, our Cauſe gaineth from it a good Argument againſt the *Ceremonies*; viz. That theſe things (being unneceſſary in themſelves) that have been ſo groſly abuſed to *Idolatry* and *Superſtition*, ought not to be brought into God's Worſhip, by them who abhor that way; nor indeed, can they without much ſcandal: But of this, and other Arguments, I have treated elſewhere.

Sect. 14. His ſecond way, how *Ceremonies* become parts of Divine Worſhip, he hath, *pag.* 347. viz. *If they be ſuppoſed to be unalterable, and obligatory to the Conſciences of all Chriſtians:* And

this he purgeth the *Church* of *England* from: What is already ſaid, doth abundantly refute this; for I have ſhewed that *Ceremonies* may be parts (tho bad ones) of Worſhip, without this, and the former too. And indeed, if this were neceſſary to make them parts of Worſhip, none of the *Popiſh Ceremonies* were ſuch; for the *Pope* will not part with his Power of altering the Worſhip of God, as he pleaſeth, more than the *Engliſh Convocation* will. And I believe, there was never *Church* in the world, that held, That ſhe could injoyn what God had not injoyned, unalterable, and ſo as to bind all Chriſtians. But ſtill the *Doctor* (as his Cauſe doth neceſſitate every Defender of it to do) maketh an Inconſiſtency and Irreconcileableneſs between the opinion of the *Church* about the *Ceremonies*, and their Practice, in reference to them: If they be alterable, why will ye rather ruine your Brethren, hazard Souls, rend the *Church*, than alter them? If they bind not our Conſciences, why do ye charge us with Sin, for refuſing them? If they bind not all men, why is the Worſhip of other *Churches* ſo cryed out upon, by many of your *Church?*

Sect. 15. The Reverend *Dr. cometh now*, Sect. 29. *to examine the Charge againſt the* Church, and bringeth the Arguments of his Adverſaries, that tend to prove the *Ceremonies* to be parts of Worſhip, and anſwereth them. It is here to be obſerved, that the Arguments that he mentioneth, are but ſome of many, that we uſe againſt the *Ceremonies:* And theſe, not they that are moſt directly againſt them. Mr. *A.* Argueth thus: An outward viſible Sign of inward inviſible Grace, whereby a Perſon is dedicated to a Profeſſion of, and Subjection to the Redeemer, is a ſubſtantial part of Worſhip. The *Dr.* Anſwereth: *An outward viſible Sign, repreſenting between men, the duty or engagement of another, is no part, much leſs a ſubſtantial part of Worſhip.* I know not how this anſwereth the Argument, or to what end it is brought; for the Argument ſpeaketh of a Sign dedicating us to the Redeemer, the anſwer of one mans duty to another. I alſo wonder that the *Dr.* who a little above confounded a real and ſubſtantial part of VVorſhip, ſhould diſtinguiſh between ſome part of it, which is all one with a real part, and a ſubſtantial part.

For further Anſwer, the *Dr.* diſtinguiſheth a three-fold Sign: 1. *Repreſenting Gods Grace to us, as Sacraments.* 2. *Repreſenting mens ſubjection to God, theſe are parts of Worſhip.* 3. *Signs from men to men, to repreſent ſome other thing, beſide the bare Action, and theſe*

are ſignificant Ceremonies, ſuch as is the Croſs in Baptiſm. He ſaith that, *after the child is Baptiſed, the Croſs is uſed in token that he ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt Crucified. This ſign is made not to God, even as the* Primitive Chriſtians *uſed the ſign of the Croſs as a declarative ſign to man; it in Baptiſm repreſenteth the Duty, not the Grace; that is ours, and we appoint the ſign for it; this God's, and he muſt appoint the ſign for it.*

Sect. 16. To this his Anſwer, I repone. 1. Sacraments do not only repreſent Gods Grace to us, but our Duty to him; for they are Seals of the Covenant, and the Covenant is mutual containing a Promiſe of Grace from God, and our duty to Him; wherefore, a Sacrament, as it Sealeth both, doth alſo Repreſent both. I wonder that the Learned *Dr.* for the ſake of a few paultery *Ceremonies*, ſhould thus mangle the uſe of the Sacraments of the *New Teſtament*, when he cannot otherwiſe defend theſe *Ceremonies*; but what will not men do or ſay to ſerve a deſign? 2. Signs repreſenting our Duty to God, are parts of Worſhip, he acknowledgeth; he meaneth repreſenting to God that which is our Duty. Now the *Dr.* ſhould have told us what are theſe Signs that repreſent our Duty to God; it is like, he meaneth Prayer, Praiſes, and ſuch like; but theſe do not ſo much repreſent to God our Duty, as offer it, or pay it to him: when I pay money to a man that I owed him; this is not a ſign repreſenting the mony to him which is his due, but a giving of it to him: And indeed, we cannot without a very unfit *Catachreſis* be ſaid to repreſent to God, by a ſign, what is our Duty. For, *Signum* (as *Auguſtine* defineth it) *eſt res præter ſpeciem quam ſenſibus ingerit aliud aliquid ex ſe faciens in cognitionem venire.* And all acknowledge, that it is eſſential to the notion of a ſign, to bring one to the knowledge of ſomewhat, which cannot be applyed to God who knoweth all things actually, and intuitively, at all times; beſide, that a ſign is a ſenſible thing, and Senſes are not to be aſcribed to God, and therefore God knoweth not any thing by ſigns.

Sect. 17. 3. His thoughts ſeem to run very muddy in managing this diſtinction; eſpecially in explaining the third member of it, *Signs from men to men, repreſenting ſome other thing than the bare Action.* What meaneth he by this laſt Clauſe? do not all Signs repreſent ſomewhat beſide the bare Action, or beſide themſelves? ſo that he here deſcribeth his third Member of his diſtinction, by the general notion of the thing diſtinguiſhed, which is a great er-

ror

ror in *Logick*. 4. Signs are rather to be distinguished by their Original, which giveth them a signification, or maketh them representative, than by the persons to whom they hold forth what they signify; for every Sign doth represent the thing signified by it, to all that can discern. Hence all who treat of Signs, use to distinguish them in *natural*, *customary* and *instituted*, as having their power to signify, or represent somewhat, either from their *nature*, or from *custom*, or from *institution*, or they will of the Imposer of the signification; and this last sort they make to be *Divine*, when they are appointed by God for their use of signifying or representing somewhat, or *Humane*, when they are appointed by man. This distinction of Signs giveth some light, but I know no use of the *Drs.* new Coined distinction, but to confound the matter and serve a design. Now the *Sacraments* are Signs instituted by God to represent his Grace, and our Engagement, and this is represented to our selves, and to all the world; the other duties wherein we express our subjection to, and dependance on God before all the world, and offer up our acknowledgments of these to him; these are also appointed by him, and so are parts of VVorship that are acceptable to him; for the *Ceremonies*, they are meerly humane Signs, appointed by man, and therefore they are not acceptable VVorship; but that they are parts of VVorship, is not from their Original, but from the Religious state that they are placed in; they are Solemn Actions, done in and with the Solemn VVorship of God, and so appropriated to it, as that they are not done but in it; they have all that could make an external act of VVorship, except Divine institution; they are designed for the same uses with true VVorship; *viz.* Honouring God, and Edifying Men. On these Accounts they are to be accounted parts of VVorship, and want of God's appointment doth not hinder that, otherwise there could be no false VVorship, neither can their signifying to man, what they do signify, hinder it; for the true VVorship of God doth that as hath been said.

Sect. 18. 5. The *Dr.* seemeth to lay some weight on this, that the *Cross* is used after Baptism; but he will not deny; 1. That it is used immediately after it, or rather conjoyned with it, as near as two actions can be to one another. Nor, 2. VVill he deny that it is included in, and not used after the complex action of Baptism, which taketh in Instruction about the nature of Baptism, Prayer and Thanksgiving; it is not after all this, and so it is stated

ted in, and mixed with this ſolemn piece of Religious VVorſhip, and therefore muſt be a religious thing; it cannot poſſibly be a civil right under ſuch circumſtances. 6. It was to no purpoſe to mention here the Antients uſe of the ſign of the *Croſs*, for that was in War, or other civil Actions, which could have no appearance of making it a *Religious Ceremony*. 7. That the *Croſs* in Baptiſm repreſenteth the Duty, and not the Grace of Subjection to the Redeemer, doth not hinder it to be a Sacramental Sign; (though we never thought it a Sign of Grace, as the Sacraments are) for Sacraments repreſent, alſo our Duty, as hath been ſhewed; and its being ſo conjoyned with the Sacrament; maketh a ſhew as if men would by it repreſent that Grace by which we muſt ſubject our ſelves to the Redeemer, which yet they cannot do. VVhen men take upon them to add a new Sign to the Sacramental Sign inſtituted by Chriſt, for repreſenting the one half of what is repreſented by Chriſt's Sign; *viz.* one part of the Covenant there ſealed which is ſubjection to, and owning of the Redeemer, and put this their ſign, in the ſame Religious ſtate with Chriſt's Sign, ſo as there is no difference between them, but the Authority by which they are inſtituted; it may be warrantably ſaid that they make a Sacramental Sign, and that they make a new Sacrament as far as man can make it. 8. That we may deviſe a Sign to repreſent the Duty in Baptiſm, becauſe the Duty is ours, as God appointeth the Sign to repreſent the Grace, becauſe that is his, is a ſtrange aſſertion; for that is to allow man an equal ſhare with God in inſtituting a Sacrament, in which both the Grace of God, and the Duty of Man, or his engagement to his Duty, are ſealed, and repreſented. If *Ceremonies* muſt have ſuch Divinity to defend them, I ſhall be leſs in love with them than before.

Sect. 19. He denyeth, *p.* 349. that the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, *is intended by the Church as a Sign of immediate Dedication to God, but of Obligation on the perſon*, and laboureth to clear the *thirtieth Canon*, aſſerting the contrary, which ſaith, that *by it the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him who died on the Croſs*. VVhat he ſaith for vindicating this Canon, is, that *Baptiſm is compleat before Croſſing, and ſo it is no part of Baptiſmal dedication*; and that, *the Miniſter Baptiſeth in the Name of Chriſt, but ſigneth with the Croſs in the name of the Church, who by that Rite, receiveth the Infant into their number*; and thus underſtanding the uſe of the *Croſs*, he ſaith, *all the difficulties about dedicating, covenanting Symbolical Sacramental Signs, will appear to be of no force*. Anſwer, 1. The *Dr.* would ſay ſomething,

by

by mentioning *Immediate Dedication*: and if what he intendeth by it be to the purpose, it must be, that the *Church* may not institute a Sign, whereby one is *Immediately* dedicated to God; but they may institute one, whereby he is *Immediately* dedicated to God: Now if the *Dr.* had given any hint of a ground for this distinction, or to shew that the one is more lawful than the other, he would have obliged us; but that not being done his implyed distinction is to be rejected as without all ground. 2. *A Sign of Obligation of the Person to dedicate himself to the Redeemer*, used in a piece of Gods solemn Worship, and appropriated to that Worship, is by its Signification, its End, its concomitant Circumstances, so stated, as the using of that Sign cannot but be a Religious Act, and so a part of God's VVorship, which (as the *Dr.* himself confesseth) needeth Divine Institution, and cannot lawfully be appointed by the Church. 3. I wonder why the *Dr.* should endeavour to vindicate that *Canon* that he citeth, from meaning what it expresly saith; *viz.* that *by the sign of the Cross, the Infant is dedicated to the service of him who Died on the Cross*; it is impossible to shun expounding this of a dedicating Sign without doing the greatest violence Imaginable to the plain words, neither is there the least shadow of ground, to think, that *Immediate dedication* is not here meant, seeing the Infant is said to be dedicated by this Sign, without the least hint of any intervenient dedicating sign, or cause between the sign, and that which the *Dr.* will call *Immediate Dedication*. 4. VVhen he saith the *Crossing* is no part of Baptismal dedication, the meaning must be, it is not a part of *Dedication* by that Sign that Christ appointed; *viz.* Baptising in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, none doubteth of that; but how doth this shew that it is no dedicating sign, as the *Canon* saith; or no immediate dedicating sign, as the *Dr.* alledgeth: It is a sign devised by men, to dedicate the Infant, added to the sign appointed by God for the same end. Now our Question is, VVhat warrant have men for making such an Addition to so great an Ordinance of God? 5. The next thing for vindicating the *Canon* is, that *the Minister Baptiseth in the Name of Christ*; *but Signeth in the Name of the Church*, is as little for his purpose: for who gave the *Church* Power to Institute a dedicating Sign to be Administer'd in her name, and set it up by Christ's dedicating Sign, to be Administer'd in his Name? This seemeth to be an addition to Christ's Ordinance, and a reflection on it as imperfect; as if the Child were not sufficiently dedicated to the Redeemer by Christ's Sign that he hath Instituted for that End.

6. It

6. It doth leaſt of all vindicate the *Canon*, which he addeth; to wit, that by it (the ſign of the *Croſs*) the *Church* receiveth the Infant into their number; for this is a quite other thing than the *Canon* ſaith; and to make that the meaning of the *Canon*, is to take a liberty to impoſe what meaning upon it he pleaſeth. Let the Reader now judge, whether by any thing that he hath ſaid, all the difficulties about Dedicating, Covenanting, Symbolical, Sacramental ſigns, do appear to be of no force.

Sect. 20. He asketh, *page* 350. *Why may not the Church appoint ſuch a rite of admiſſion of one of her Members, declaring it to be no part of Baptiſm? Anſwer.* The *Church* hath not appointed it as a rite of admiſſion of a Member, but a rite of dedicating the Perſon to Chriſt as hath been ſhewed. And the reaſon why he may not do it, is, becauſe Chriſt hath already done it ſufficiently: He hath appointed Baptiſm both for dedicating the Perſon to himſelf, and for admitting him into his *Church:* Therefore men ought not to contrive their ſigns for that end, which he hath abundantly provided for, by his own means. Another reaſon why this may not be done, is, becauſe this ſign is ſo ſtated in the Word of God, by being done in the Solemn Exerciſe of it, for a Religious end; and appropriated to this Religious Exerciſe, that it cannot be otherwiſe lookt on than as a piece of Gods Worſhip. He parallelleth this with holding up the hand, in an *Independent-Church* preſently after Baptiſm, as a ſign of admiſſion into that particular *Church*. *Anſwer*, 1. I know no warrant for ſuch an admitting rite, Baptiſm is ſufficient to make one a Member of Chriſts *Church*, and that maketh one a Member of any particular *Church*, where Providence caſteth his lot. 2. If *Independents* ſhould ſtate this admitting rite in the very Solemnity of Baptiſm, before the complex action be finiſhed, they were to be blamed, but they do not ſo; they make an obſervable difference as to time, and other circumſtances, between theſe two actions. 3. Signing with the *Croſs*, is not a meer admitting ſign into a particular *Church*, as ſhall afterward be diſcourſed, but alſo a dedicating ſign; as the *Canon* expreſly ſaith, and therefore this parallel is null.

Sect. 21. He next blameth Mr. *B.* for ſuppoſing, that the Miniſter ſigning the Child, ſpeaketh in the Name of Chriſt, or as his Officer, and ſaith, it is evident that he doth it in the Name of the *Church*; becauſe he ſaith, *We receive him into the Congregation of Chriſts Flock, and do ſign him*, &c. *Anſwer*, It is not material to our debate, which of the Two be ſaid; for the queſtion is, Whether

the *Church* hath power to appoint a ſign for dedicating a perſon to Chriſt, when he hath already appointed a ſign for that end? We deſire to ſee a warrant for the *Churches* appointing Dedication to Chriſt by her ſign, to be done in her name; after the perſon is already dedicated by Chriſts ſign, and in His name. If he ſay the *Church* only appoints him to be received by this ſign into her number; and that may be done in her name. I anſwer, by Chriſts ſign that is alſo done, by Baptiſm the perſon is admitted as a Member of *Chriſts* Flock. But beſide this, it is evident, that by the ſign of the *Croſs* is not intended bare admiſſion as a Member of the *Church*; but dedicating of the perſon to Chriſt, not only from the plain words of the *Canon*, of which already, but by what followeth in the words uſed at the ſigning; which are, *We receive him into the number of Chriſts Flock, and do ſign him with the ſign of the Croſs, in token that hereafter he ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt Crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner againſt Sin, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Chriſts faithful Souldier* and *Servant, unto his lives end, Amen.* Will any man ſay that this is meer admiſſion, as a Member of the *Church*, or into the *Church of England*; and that no more is intended by theſe words? Is it not made a ſign of our Covenant, or Engagement to the ſame duties that we are engaged to by Baptiſm? To wit, all the duties that the Covenant of grace bringeth us under the Obligation of. The abſurdity of this notion; to wit, that *Croſſing* is meerly an admitting ſign, will yet further appear, if we conſider, that in the ſame office of Baptiſm, uſed by the *Church of England*, the Miniſter having put the God-fathers in mind of Chriſts promiſe to the Infant to be baptiſed, he is to ſay: *Wherefore after this promiſe made by Chriſt, theſe Infants muſt alſo faithfully for their part promiſe by you that be their ſureties, that they will forſake the Devil, and all his works, and conſtantly believe Gods Holy Word, and obediently keep his Commandments:* This is the baptiſmal Dedication. I hope that will not be denied: Now, is not the *Croſs* uſed to betoken our obligation to the very ſame things? And therefore it muſt be a dedicating Sign, as well as Baptiſm. And it may as well be ſaid, that Baptiſm is meerly a rite of admiſſion into the *Church*, as that is ſuch.

Sect. 22. He telleth us, *page* 351. that *all publick admiſſions into* Societies have ſome Ceremonies belonging to them. That we deny not, and therefore Chriſt hath made Baptiſm the *Ceremony* for Solemn admitting the Members of his Church; which he having done, how

how dare any take upon them to invent new rites for that end? *As Baptiſm* (ſaith the *Doctor*) *is a rite of admiſſion into Chriſts Catholick Church, ſo is the ſign of the Croſs into our Church of* England, *in which this Ceremony is uſed, without preſcribing to other Churches.*

This now, is the fine new Notion, for the ſake of which, all the foregoing diſcourſe is deſigned: The *Dr.* deſerveth the honour of inventing it; for I do not find that ever any had thought of it before: But I doubt it will prove but a Mouſe brought forth by the long labour, and hard throws of a Mountain. I ſhall here remind the Reader of what I have obſerved already, *Part* 2. *Sect.* 1. *Sect.* 9. that by this one Notion, the *Dr.* deſtroyeth the great deſign of his Book; which is to charge them with *ſeparation*; moſt of whom he here doth implicitely, and by neceſſary conſequence, acknowledge never to have been Members of the *Church of England*; they never having been ſigned with the Croſs: For if they never were Members, they were not capable of *ſeparation*, more than another Mans Leg can be ſaid to be cut off from my body, to which it never was united. 2. This to be the uſe of the ſign of the *Croſs* was never declared by the *Church*, but the quite contrary; as is evident from what is already cited, both out of the Thirtieth *Canon*, and out of the Office of *Baptiſm*, both which are the authentick Writings of the *Church*; wherefore this is to be lookt on as but one *Doctors* Opinion; and we are to take the ſcope, and meaning of the *Churches Ceremonies* from her own declaration, and not from the thoughts of any one man, when he is ſtreightned in defending of theſe rites. 3. I ask the *Dr.* if we who never were yet ſigned with the *Croſs*, ſhould be willing now to join as Members of the *Church*; and to ſubmit to all her *terms of Communion*, whether muſt we be ſigned with the *Croſs* at our admiſſion? The ſame may be enquired concerning any Baptized in *France*, *Scotland*, or any other *Church*. I ſuppoſe he will not own ſuch *Croſſing*, I am ſure it was never heard of; if he ſay, it is not to be done, How do theſe become Members of the *Church?* The *Independents* will require ſome token of owning their *Church*-Covenant, even where it is not joined with Baptiſm, why then do not the *Church of England*, (for the *Dr.* parallelleth theſe two admiſſions into the *Church*) require this *Croſſing* out of Baptiſm, if it be meerly a ſign of admiſſion into the *Church of England?* 4. If the *Church*, and the *Dr.* too, and all the Divines that Write in defence of the *Church*, would declare never ſo often that this is the uſe, and the only uſe of *Croſſing*, all this could not ſatisfy, as long as the words uſed with it, and the Religious State in which it is by their practice fixed, do make the contrary apparent.

Sect. 23. Mr. *Bs.* allowing ſome Religious uſe of the ſign of the *Croſs*, his Brethren do not approve; yet his argument is good againſt the uſe of the *Croſs* as a dedicating, or common profeſſing ſign of Baptized Perſons; to wit, that God hath appointed Sacraments for that end: Then the *Dr.* anſwereth; *True, but not only for that end, but to be means and inſtruments of conveying grace to men; for which God only ought to appoint means.* Reply, 1. It is not enough that men do not appoint other means beſide Chriſts for all the ends that they are appointed for; but they ought not to appoint other means for any of theſe ends; becauſe Chriſts means are ſufficient for all the ends that they are appointed for: Sacraments are not only ſufficient to ſignify Gods promiſe of giving grace, but alſo to ſignify our engagement to perform duty: Wherefore we ought not to add new ſigns for the one, more than for the other. 2. The ſign of the *Croſs* is intended as a mean and inſtrument of conveying grace to men: *Ergo, ex conceſſis*, it is unlawful to be appointed by men. The antecedent I prove, for the *Church* maketh her *Ceremonies to ſtir up the dull minds of men*; and this in particular, *to be a token that hereafter the party baptized ſhall not be aſhamed of Chriſt*; therefore it muſt be a mean of ſtirring up one to own Chriſt; and is not this the very uſe of Baptiſm? What difference is there, but that the one is a mean appointed by God for conveying the grace that he hath promiſed; the other is a mean appointed by man for the ſame end?

Sect. 24. The *Dr.* chargeth the *Church* of *Rome with Inſolence, in appointing Rites for applying the Merits of Chriſt*; and ſaith, *This is the only poſſible way for a* Church *to make new Sacraments. Anſwer*, Though we have many other Arguments againſt the *Ceremonies*, than that they are Sacraments of mens making; yet we will not paſs even from that Argument. The *Drs.* aſſertion is abſolutely falſe; for a Sacrament *is a viſible Sign of invi ible Grace*; and if men appoint ſigns of their own, for repreſenting or conveying Grace, they make new Sacraments; tho' they do not intend by theſe to apply Chriſts Merit: Sacraments are for applying the Spirit of Chriſt, as well as for applying the Merit of Chriſt; and therefore if men pretend to make ſigns for the one, tho' not for the other, they make new Sacraments. We do not ſay, that every ſignificant Cuſtom in a *Church* is to paſs for a new Sacrament, as the *Dr.* would make us ſay: Sitting at the Sacrament, putting off the hat in Prayer, *&c.* (which he paralleth with the *Ceremonies*, are quite of another nature, being Actions made fit by civil Cuſtom, and for their fitneſs, uſed in worſhip, but not appropriated to it. Mr. *B.* objecteth againſt the

the *Croſs*, being a bare Rite of admiſſion; that the obligation is to the Common Duties of Chriſtianity. The *Dr.* Anſwereth; *And is not every Church-Member bound to perform theſe?* How this Anſwereth the Objection, I ſee not: For the Queſtion, is not what *Church*-Members are obliged to, but when Chriſt hath appointed a Sacramental ſign, to repreſent the common duties of Chriſtianity; whether the *Church* may appoint another ſign for the ſame end, and join that ſign with Chriſt's ſign, to be performed with it, with the ſame Solemnity, and in the ſame Office of divine worſhip? He ſaith that, *To ſhew that Croſſing is a ſolemn Rite of Admiſſion, the Church alloweth it to be forborn in private Baptiſm. Anſwer*, 1. This only ſheweth it to be a ſolemn action, not that it is a ſolemn rite of admiſſion; for all this, it may be a ſolemn Sacrament, or a ſolemn piece of other worſhip. 2. This allowance of the *Church* doth quite croſs the *Drs.* Conceit of its being a Rite of admiſſion into the *Church* of *England*; for if it were ſo look't on, the *Church* would rather injoin it then, becauſe without it, the perſon baptiſed, ſhould not at all be admitted into the *Church*, and ſo be no Member of it; and ſurely the Rite of adminiſtration to the *Church*, is more needful, where admiſſion into the univerſal *Church*; *to wit*, Baptiſm is more queſtionable, whether it hath been done or not, as in private Baptiſm, than where it is publick and known to all. To Mr. *B*'s. Objection, That Chriſts Sacraments or Symbols are ſufficient, and therefore we need not deviſe more. He Anſwereth, *If it be lawful, the* Church *is to judge of the Expediency, and to appoint other Rites that do not encroach on the Inſtitutions of* Chriſt, *by challenging any effect peculiar to them, is no charging them with inſufficiency.* Reply, 1. Mr. *B.* and others aſſert, and prove the unlawfulneſs of theſe Rites, as the *Dr.* well knoweth; wherefore he might well have expounded, *We need not deviſe*, by, *We ought not deviſe.* 2. There are other ways how mens Rites may encroach on Chriſt's Inſtitutions, than by challenging any effect peculiar to them, when as they are appropriated to Religion, uſed in, or amidſt Religious Exerciſes, and for Religious Ends. 3. Dedicating a perſon to God, engaging the Soul to own Chriſt, and ſuch like, are effects peculiar to Chriſt's Inſtitutions; for they are inſtituted for theſe ends, and nothing elſe hath any efficacy that way, being deſtitute of the promiſe of a Bleſſing: Wherefore, even on that account, and by his own Confeſſion, our *Ceremonies* import a charging of God's Ordinances with inſufficiency.

Sect. 25. The reſt of his debate with Mr. *B. pag.* 353, 354. I wave, it being *ad hominem*, only on a principle of Mr. *B*'s. that I allow

Sect. 23. Mr. *Bs.* allowing ſome Religious uſe of the ſign of the *Croſs*, his Brethren do not approve; yet his argument is good againſt the uſe of the *Croſs* as a dedicating, or common profeſſing ſign of Baptized Perſons; to wit, that God hath appointed Sacraments for that end: Then the *Dr.* anſwereth; *True, but not only for that end, but to be means and inſtruments of conveying grace to men; for which God only ought to appoint means.* Reply, 1. It is not enough that men do not appoint other means beſide Chriſts for all the ends that they are appointed for; but they ought not to appoint other means for any of theſe ends; becauſe Chriſts means are ſufficient for all the ends that they are appointed for: Sacraments are not only ſufficient to ſignify Gods promiſe of giving grace, but alſo to ſignify our engagement to perform duty: Wherefore we ought not to add new ſigns for the one, more than for the other. 2. The ſign of the *Croſs* is intended as a mean and inſtrument of conveying grace to men: *Ergo, ex conceſſis*, it is unlawful to be appointed by men. The antecedent I prove, for the *Church* maketh her *Ceremonies to ſtir up the dull minds of men*; and this in particular, *to be a token that hereafter the party baptized ſhall not be aſhamed of Chriſt*; therefore it muſt be a mean of ſtirring up one to own Chriſt; and is not this the very uſe of Baptiſm? What difference is there, but that the one is a mean appointed by God for conveying the grace that he hath promiſed; the other is a mean appointed by man for the ſame end?

Sect. 24. The *Dr.* chargeth the *Church* of *Rome with Inſolence, in appointing Rites for applying the Merits of Chriſt*; and ſaith, *This is the only poſſible way for a* Church *to make new Sacraments.* *Anſwer*, Though we have many other Arguments againſt the *Ceremonies*, than that they are Sacraments of mens making; yet we will not paſs even from that Argument. The *Drs.* aſſertion is abſolutely falſe; for a Sacrament *is a viſible Sign of inviſible Grace*; and if men appoint ſigns of their own, for repreſenting or conveying Grace, they make new Sacraments; tho' they do not intend by theſe to apply Chriſts Merit: Sacraments are for applying the Spirit of Chriſt, as well as for applying the Merit of Chriſt; and therefore if men pretend to make ſigns for the one, tho' not for the other, they make new Sacraments. We do not ſay, that every ſignificant Cuſtom in a *Church* is to paſs for a new Sacrament, as the *Dr.* would make us ſay: Sitting at the Sacrament, putting off the hat in Prayer, *&c.* (which he paralleth with the *Ceremonies*, are quite of another nature, being Actions made fit by civil Cuſtom, and for their fitneſs, uſed in worſhip, but not appropriated to it. Mr. *B.* objecteth againſt the

the *Croſs*, being a bare Rite of admiſſion; that the obligation is to the Common Duties of Chriſtianity. The *Dr.* Anſwereth; *And is not every Church-Member bound to perform theſe?* How this Anſwereth the Objection, I ſee not: For the Queſtion, is not what *Church*-Members are obliged to, but when Chriſt hath appointed a Sacramental ſign, to repreſent the common duties of Chriſtianity; whether the *Church* may appoint another ſign for the ſame end, and join that ſign with Chriſt's ſign, to be performed with it, with the ſame Solemnity, and in the ſame Office of divine worſhip? He ſaith that, *To ſhew that Croſſing is a ſolemn Rite of Admiſſion, the Church alloweth it to be forborn in private Baptiſm. Anſwer*, 1. This only ſheweth it to be a ſolemn action, not that it is a ſolemn rite of admiſſion; for all this, it may be a ſolemn Sacrament, or a ſolemn piece of other worſhip. 2. This allowance of the *Church* doth quite croſs the *Drs.* Conceit of its being a Rite of admiſſion into the *Church* of *England*; for if it were ſo look't on, the *Church* would rather injoin it then, becauſe without it, the perſon baptiſed, ſhould not at all be admitted into the *Church*, and ſo be no Member of it; and ſurely the Rite of adminiſtration to the *Church*, is more needful, where admiſſion into the univerſal *Church*; *to wit*, Baptiſm is more queſtionable, whether it hath been done or not, as in private Baptiſm, than where it is publick and known to all. To Mr. *B*'s. Objection, That Chriſts Sacraments or Symbols are ſufficient, and therefore we need not deviſe more. He Anſwereth, *If it be lawful, the* Church *is to judge of the Expediency, and to appoint other Rites that do not encroach on the Inſtitutions of* Chriſt, *by challenging any effect peculiar to them, is no charging them with inſufficiency.* Reply, 1. Mr. *B.* and others aſſert, and prove the unlawfulneſs of theſe Rites, as the *Dr.* well knoweth; wherefore he might well have expounded, *We need not deviſe*, by, *We ought not deviſe*. 2. There are other ways how mens Rites may encroach on Chriſt's Inſtitutions, than by challenging any effect peculiar to them, when as they are appropriated to Religion, uſed in, or amidſt Religious Exerciſes, and for Religious Ends. 3. Dedicating a perſon to God, engaging the Soul to own Chriſt, and ſuch like, are effects peculiar to Chriſt's Inſtitutions; for they are inſtituted for theſe ends, and nothing elſe hath any efficacy that way, being deſtitute of the promiſe of a Bleſſing: Wherefore, even on that account, and by his own Confeſſion, our *Ceremonies* import a charging of God's Ordinances with inſufficiency.

Sect. 25. The reſt of his debate with Mr. *B. pag.* 353, 354. I wave, it being *ad hominem*, only on a principle of Mr. *B*'s. that I allow

allow not. He pleadeth againſt Mr. *B. pag.* 355. that *the ſign of the Croſs, if it had* Chriſt's *Inſtitution, would be a Sacrament; becauſe then it ſhould have promiſes annexed, and the nature of it quite changed, and the Miniſter ſhould ſign in* Chriſt's *Name not in the* Church's. *Anſwer.* The Nature of it would be then changed, no doubt, becauſe it would be a true Sacrament, and have the annexed Bleſſing; but there would be no other Change from what it now is, than what dependeth upon the Authority, by which it is inſtituted. But that doth not hinder it to be now a *Mock Sacrament*, and to have as much of a Sacrament as is poſſible, without divine inſtitution. The Miniſters ſigning now in the name of the *Church*, which he then would do in the Name of Chriſt, ſaith no more, but that in the one caſe it is Chriſt's Ordinance, but in the other caſe it is Mans Ordinance, but doth not hinder it in that caſe, to be a humane Sacrament. Whether Mr. *B.* do miſrepreſent the Popiſh Doctrine, about the efficacy of Sacraments, or not (which the *Doctor* by many Teſtimonies endeavoureth to prove, *pag.* 357, 358.) is not much to our buſineſs. The *Doctor* ſaith, *That if by the Proteſtant Doctrine, the Sacraments do at all convey Grace, whatever way it be done, it ſheweth that the ſign of the Croſs can never be advanced to that Dignity; ſince, in no ſence it is held to be an Inſtrument for conveying of Grace. Anſwer.* It is true, it is by this excluded from being a true Sacrament: But it may, for all that, be a falſe Sacrament; for though it be not their opinion, that it conveyeth Grace, yet it is by them held to be a mean of ſtirring up the mind, and engaging the Soul to theſe Acts, to which, nothing but the Grace of God can effectually help a perſon. I hope the *Doctors* Concluſion of this debate with Mr. *B.* may now appear to be groundleſs; *to wit, That this Phraſe of a new Sacrament is groundleſs, and only invented to amuſe People:* Neither can I underſtand what ſort of people theſe ſhould be, *who have been ſatisfied againſt all the other Arguments* (which he calleth *conveying their prejudices*) *and have ſo ſtuck at this ſtumbling block*; for we bring many Arguments againſt the *Ceremonies*, that more weight is to be laid on, though this wanteth not its force.

Sect. 26. The *Dr.* is pleaſed, *Sect.* 32. to engage in a debate with Mr. *A.* about *bowing at the Name of Jeſus*, and counts oppoſing it; *a blow at the Church.* If the *Dr.* would have defended this *Ceremony*, he ſhould have anſwered what is of purpoſe, learnedly and ſolidly written againſt it by Mr *William Wicken*, and twelve arguments againſt it by another hand; and not ſatisfied himſelf with anſwering ſome occaſional reflections made on it by Mr. *A.*: But this *Ceremony* being

impoſed

impoſed by the *Church*, as one of the terms of her Communion (which I knew not till I find the *Dr.* here doth not deny it) I ſhall a little conſider it, by propoſing our ſcruples againſt the uſe of it; and taking off the edge of what the *Dr.* bringeth in defence of it. But we muſt firſt conſider the true ſtate of the controverſy; which is not, whether all poſſible Honour be due to the Glorious Perſon who is ſo Named? Nor whether it be unlawful at the hearing of that Name or any other Name, whereby that Bleſſed Perſon, or either of the other Perſons of the God-head are deſigned, to have the heart raiſed to adore that Majeſty, whom Saints and Angels Worſhip? Yea, nor thirdly, whether it be in it ſelf, and always a ſin to expreſs our adoration of him by an outward ſign of kneeling, as bowing, or lifting up the eyes, when the heart is thus excited by the mention of his Name or any of theſe other Names? All theſe we readily yield: And our Brethren, on the other hand, grant, that no Worſhip, direct or indirect, mediate, nor immediate, (ſuch as *Papiſts* give to their Images) is due to the Name, *i. e.* the Word. 2. That there is no duty lying upon People always, and every where to bow at the hearing of this Name; for they appoint it only to be done in the time of Worſhip: The 18 *Canon* preſcribeth it only in time of divine Service; it is not there reſtricted to the Leſſons, and the Creed, as the *Dr.* alledgeth, *page* 362. In the Injunctions of Queen *Elizabeths* Sermons are alſo taken in, & a general clauſe (*when otherwiſe in the Church mentioned*) carrieth it to all acts of Worſhip; which the *Dr.* without ground would limit; to wit, when they are not imployed in any other act of Devotion. 3. They make it no natural, but inſtituted piece of Worſhip; the *Dr.* all along ſpeaketh of it only as lawful, never pleadeth for the neceſſity of it, and defendeth it only ſo far as it is required by the *Church*. It is true, ſome of them plead Scripture for it; to wit, *Phil.* 2. 10. and by conſequence muſt make it a duty, as naturally neceſſary, as praying, and believing: But I do not find that the learned among them do inſiſt on this. The queſtion then is, 1. Whether it be lawful for the *Church* to command People to uſe outward ſigns of reverence, by bowing the head or knee, or otherwiſe, when ever they hear the Name of Jeſus mentioned in Divine Worſhip, when yet no ſuch injunction is given in reference to any other Name of Gods? 2. Whether it be lawful for People to obey ſuch commands? To both, our Brethren anſwer affirmatively; and we anſwer negatively.

Sect. 27. The ſame reaſons will ſerve for both parts of our opinion.

on. They are 1. This Bowing is an uncommanded piece of Worſhip. *Ergo*, it is unlawful. The conſequence dependeth on Chriſt's condemning of *Mens Traditions* in his Worſhip, as vain, on this account, that they are the Commands of Men, *Math.* 15. 9. *Mark* 7. 7. of which before. And I think the *Doctor* will not deny it, who owns that Acts of Worſhip muſt have divine Warrant, *page*, 348. The Antecedent hath Two Parts; *to wit*, that this Act is uncommanded, and that it an Act of Worſhip. For the Firſt: Few of our Brethren alledge a Command for it; for then it ſhould not be indifferent, as they make it, and they that plead a Command, found it in *Phil.* 2. 10. But that place doth no way injoin any ſuch *Rite*: For *firſt*, the Greek Text is plain, not *at*, but *in*, the Name of JESUS: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι; which to expound of Bowing at the hearing of the Word, is the greateſt Violence that can be done to plain Words: For the plain ſenſe, is, that ſubjection to his Dignity and Power, ſhall be yielded by all Creatures. 2. This Text can no way be reſtricted to the Reverence given in Divine Service, but muſt either prove this a duty at all times, when this Name is uttered, or it proveth no ſuch expreſſion of Reverence at all. 3. The Text ſpeaketh only of *kneeling*; and I know not that it is in the *Churches* Power, where the Lord commandeth kneeling, to change it into bowing of the Head. 4. If this be injoined, ſo is confeſſing with the Tongue, *ver.* 11. What power hath the *Church*, to pick and chuſe Scripture-Commandments, to injoin one, and neglect another of equal Authority? But why do I ſtay on this, many Epiſcopal men, and even ſome *Papiſts*, look on this Text, as nothing to the purpoſe in hand; for the Second Part of the Antecedent, that this Bowing is an Act of Worſhip, I hope that will not be denyed, it being a direct and ſolemn adoring of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and the ſtating of it in Divine Service, and appropriating it to that, doth conſtrain men to look ſo upon it.

Sect. 28. Argument 2. It is not reaſonable Service; *Ergo*, It is not acceptable Service. The Conſequence, I hope, will not be denyed: The Antecedent I prove, becauſe no Reaſon can be given for bowing at the hearing of this Word, rather than at the mention of theſe other Names, by which, God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, or our Bleſſed Redeemer are called. It is not enough, that ſome Reaſon can be pretended for this practice ſingly conſidered: For 1. Whatever Reaſons be given for it, do equally concern other Names of GOD and CHRIST; and therefore, muſt either prove the

Church

Church faulty, in not inſtituting Worſhip to all theſe names, or they prove nothing at all. 2. Our main ſcruple is at the diſcrimination that is made by this *Ceremony*, between this name, and others that are equally holy; therefore, they muſt either give a reaſon, why adoration is fit in this caſe, rather than in the other caſes, or they do not reach the Queſtion. The Reaſons given by the learned *Hooker*, *Eccleſ. polic. lib.* 5. *Sect.* 30. are not concludent; *to wit*, 1. *It ſheweth a reverend regard to the Son of God. Anſwer*, 1. Let the Father and Spirit have the ſame reverend regard. 2. Every way of expreſſing our regard to him, is not warrantable: He hath appointed ways for it, and not left them to our deviſing. 2. He ſaith, *It maketh much againſt the* Arians, *who deny his God-head: Anſwer*, 1. His way of convincing gain-ſayers, is by the Word; we muſt not deviſe ways of our own to convince Hereticks; *Moſes* and the Prophets, being God's way, are more powerful to convince, than if one were ſent from the dead; and therefore, much more than ſuch a fooliſh *Ceremony*. 3. If this Argument prove any thing, it would make it our duty rather to bow to him, when his name is mentioned in Blaſphemy, or Swearing: Then ſuch a Teſtimony is more needful, than when all preſent are worſhiping him.

Sect. 29. Argument 3. It is ſuperſtitious Worſhip, not only on the account of its not being commanded; but alſo becauſe it is impoſſible to make that uſe of a name, without aſcribing more to it than is due, to a word, or any external ſign. I know our Brethren will deny all reſpect to the word, and affirm that it is only the Perſon of the Redeemer that they reverence: And I am obliged to believe that they make not the name, the *Objectum Terminans*, of any part of their Worſhip, yet the ſetting ſuch a mark of diſcrimination on that name, from others, and giving ſuch Reverence on that occaſion, is ſuch a violent preſumption of ſome inward Reſpect to that word, rather than to another of equal Excellency, that a man ought not to believe himſelf, when he denyeth it of himſelf, much leſs are others obliged to believe him: Eſpecially, the *Church*-Guides, who impoſe this, muſt either ſee ſome Reaſon for it, or none; if none, it is *Church*-Tyranny, to impoſe ſo arbitrarily in the Worſhip of God: If they ſee a Reaſon, that Reaſon cannot ſhun to be ſuperſtitious; *to wit*, a making a difference in this name from others, where there is no ſuch difference: And if it were poſſible to free the mind of ſuperſtitious Conceits in this matter, it is altogether impoſſible to free the action from a ſcandalous appearance of

ſuperſtition; for what other Conſtruction can the Beholder put on bowing ſo many times at the recurrent mention of a word, when no ſuch thing is done at the mention of other words of the ſame ſignification? May not one rationally think, that it is not the thing ſignified, but the ſound of the word that moveth men, when they ſee them bow at that word, and not at another, that expreſſeth the ſame thing? If I ſee a man frighted at the hearing the word *Enſis*, and not moved at hearing *Gladius*, I have reaſon to think, that it is not the apprehenſion of a Sword, which is ſignified by both words, that doth ſo move him, but ſome Antipathy he hath at the ſound of the word *Enſis*: This is eaſily applyed.

Sect. 30. Argument 4. It is impoſſible to obſerve this uſage punctually, without having the mind diverted from that attention to the other Acts of Religion, that is fit. Men may talk what they will, but common Experience will convince the unbyaſſed, that it is impoſſible to hear with ſerious attention, toward the matter read, or otherwiſe ſpoken, to go along with it in the heart, and at the ſame time to be ready at the ſound of the word *Jeſus*, to catch it, and to uſe the Reverence required. I appeal to the Experience of them who do ſeriouſly mind this bowing, whether their mind be not taken up with thoughts about the word, waiting for it before they hear it, ſo as they cannot at the ſame time, mind what elſe is ſpoken, as they ought. Here we may apply that Adage; *Vides aliquem de vocibus ſolicitum, ſcito animum in puſillis occupatum.* The mind cannot be intent on two things at once, ſuch as are one ſingle word, and the matter of a coherent Diſcourſe. Argument 5. It is an uſage unknown to the Apoſtolick & pureſt Primitive Times of the *Church*; yea, it is amongſt the moſt novel Inventions of the later, and more corrupted Times of the *Church*, under the Anti-Chriſtian Apoſtacy; no mention of it, till the middle of the 13*th.* Century. It was never injoined, till *Concil. Lugdunenſ.* 1273. and *Baſilienſ.* 1431. Argument 6*th.* It hath been groſly abuſed to Superſtition and Idolatry, in the *Popiſh Church*, and therefore being confeſſed to be an indifferent thing, it ought to be aboliſhed. In a Council at *Auſpurg*, this bowing is injoined at the name of the body and blood of Chriſt, of the Virgin *Mary*, and ſeveral others of their σεβάσματα, *Concil. Lugdun.* it is injoined chiefly in the Maſs. It argueth a ſtrange reſpect to that way, thus to ſymbolize with them in their uſages, that have no warrant in the word; and by ſo doing, to differ from all Proteſtant *Churches*.

Sect. 31.

Sect. 31. I come now to attend the *Doctor*'s debate with Mr. *A.* about this matter, where I am troubled to find the *Dr.* treating his Adversary with such Contempt, and indecent Reflections, on his learning, which maketh him be honoured in the eyes of men, as able to discern, as they who despise him; telleth us, *He had before defended these things, as required by the* Church, *against Papists*; *and* Mr. A. *borroweth their Weapons, but doth not so well manage them.* We give the Author his due Praise for his learned Labours against the *Papists*, but are not thereby obliged to be silent, when he opposeth any of the Truths of God: But I cannot understand how Mr. *A.* should borrow the *Popish* Weapons in this Controversy, seeing the *Papists* and the *Doctor* are in this matter ὁμοφύλοι; and Mr. *A.* doth oppose them both: It is true, a *Non-conformist* may say, that *Papists* have as good reason for their *Ceremonies*, as the *Church of England* for hers: But this is not to use their Weapons; for we think neither hath reason on their side. Mr. *A.* blameth the *Doctor* in answering his *Popish* Adversary, for saying, *That bowing at the name of* Jesus, *is no more, than going to* Church *at tolling of a Bell.* To which Mr. *A.* replyeth, That it is *Motivum cultus*, at least; and so more than the tolling of a Bell, to call people to Church; and he addeth, that an Image may as well give warning to the eye, to worship, as a Bell to the ear. Here Mr. *A.* is far from either pleading for *Popish* Tenets, or using *Popish* Weapons; but sheweth the absurdity of the *Doctor*'s opinion, by a parallel opinion of the *Papists*, which the *Dr.* condemneth; which is a good way of reasoning *ad hominem*, and needed not be so cryed out against. The *Dr.* giveth some good Reasons, why Images are not to be used in worship, but he doth not touch the Point in hand, between him and Mr. *A.* who never intended to parallel a Bell and Images any further than this; that a Bell in the Act of Worship (the sound of the word *Jesus* is in the same quality) must be *Motivum cultus*, and so is an Image. Therefore, if an Image not only on other accounts, that the *Dr.* mentioneth, but even on account of this lower use of it, its being *motivum cultus*, be evil; so is the sound of the word *Jesus*.

Sect. 32. The *Dr.* exposeth Mr. *A.* as a crackt delirious man, for saying, that *the Papists go too far in preferring an Image higher than to be* motivum cultus, *but the question is, whether they do not sin in applying it to this lower use, to make it an ordinary stated motive to Worship.* And after, *if men sin who make an Image an ordinary stated motive of Wor-*

ſhip, yet how ſhall we excuſe our own adorations? Sure the application of all this to the preſent Controverſy is not ſo hard to be underſtood; but that a man, whoſe wit is not a wool-gathering, may ſee theſe are not the words of a delirious man. He doth not charge the *Church* of *England*, with uſing Images, but with uſing the ſound of a word to the ſame purpoſe, with the lower uſe that *Papiſts* aſcribe to Images; and inferreth, that if the one be a ſin, ſo is the other; and the one may as lawfully be done as the other. The adorations he ſpeaketh of are worſhipping God by the help of the ſound of that word, as *a motivum cultus*; and therefore there is no need of proving that ye Worſhip any other beſide God, before ye need excuſe your adorations. The *Dr.* confeſſeth, *page* 361. that *their Church never denied that men ſin in making Images a ſtated motive of Worſhip:* Hence Mr. *A.* inferreth, that their *Church* ſinneth in making the ſound of a word a ſtated motive of Worſhip; but this the *Dr.* is not pleaſed to take notice of: But when Mr. *A.* aſſerteth, that they may bring in Images with equal reaſon, the *Dr.* denieth that we may worſhip Images on the ſame reaſon, that we perform external adoration to *Jeſus* at the mention of his Name; ſtill he will not take notice wherein the parallel, and conſequently, the ſtrength of the reaſon lieth; to wit, in making Images a motive of worſhip; and making a word ſuch; but the *Dr.* paralleleth making Images the object of Worſhip, and making the word *Jeſus*, the occaſion only of it; which is to ſeek *ſubterfuges*; not to ſtand to the argument inſiſted on.

Sect. 33. Mr. *A.* giveth a difference between the tolling of a Bell to call People to *Church*, and the word *Jeſus* occaſioning, our bowing, that the one is out of worſhip, the other in it; when we ſhould be intent on devotion. In anſwering this the *Dr.* ſaith, *They contend not for the ſeaſonableneſs of this bowing when they are in other acts of devotion, and immediate application to God; but about the lawfulneſs of it in repeating the Leſſons or the Creed.* Reply, 1. I have before ſhewed that this is not the ſenſe of the *Church*, which injoineth it in time of *Divine Service*; which I hope taketh in prayer: yea, when ever that *Name* is mentioned in the *Church*, wherefore the *Dr.* muſt be ſore put to it, when he muſt defend the *Church* by contradicting her, and ſetting up his private opinion that he is forced upon, againſt her Authentick and publick Records. 2. Here are two diſtinctions hinted, equally uſeleſs to this deſign. The firſt is, he pleadeth not for the ſeaſonableneſs, but for the lawfulneſs of this uſage; but if it be unſeaſonable

ſeaſonable, even at theſe times, that he will have it uſed, then it is alſo unlawful; ſeeing duties acceptable to God muſt be done in their ſeaſon. 3. The other diſtinction is, it is not to be done in acts of devotion, and immediate application to God; but in the Leſſons and Creed. I deſire to know whether hearing the Word read, and hearing the Articles of our Faith rehearſed in a ſolemn manner, while we are about Worſhipping God, be not *acts of Devotion*, and *immediate Application to God*, as well as prayer; which he ſeemeth to underſtand by that expreſſion. The word read, as well as preached, *Heb.* 4. 2. ſhould be mixed with Faith, and ſo ſhould the hearing the Articles of our Faith; and is not Faith in its exerciſe *Devotion*, and an *immediate Application to God?* At leaſt it cannot be denied, that ſerious exerciſe of the whole Soul is requiſite in theſe exerciſes, as well as in that which he will call *Devotion*; and therefore it muſt be as unſeaſonable to be diverted by waiting for the fall of a *Word*, in the one exerciſe as in the other. 4. The *Dr.* taketh no notice of the main ſtrength of Mr. *A*'s. reaſon; to wit, that the toll of the Bell is out of Worſhip; the ſound of the Word in it. The one is *in ſtatu Civili*, or *Communi*; the other in *ſtatu Religioſo*: For I hope he will not deny theſe exerciſes in which this bowing is to be uſed, to be Religious acts. He ſaith it ſignifieth nothing to this purpoſe whether perſons be in the *Church* or out of it when the Bell rings; for in the ſame *page* he (Mr. *A.*) mentioneth the Maſs-bell, which ringeth in Worſhip; and if the object of their Worſhip were right, it would make him better underſtand the parallel. *Reply*, It is a raſh aſſertion to ſay there is no difference between the Bell ringing when People are in the *Church*, and when they are out of it, (he muſt mean when they are in the act of Worſhip, and when not; otherwiſe what he ſaith is impertinent) for the one is *motivum Cultus*, and *in ſtatu Religioſo*, the other not: It is true, Mr. *A.* mentioneth the Maſs-bell in the next *page*, but he parallelleth it with the ſound of the Word *Jeſus*; both being a ſtated motive of Worſhip, and therefore that is mentioned by the *Dr.* to no purpoſe.

Sect. 34. He ſaith, when it is ſaid in the *Injunctions*, that *we muſt bow at mentioning the Name* Jeſus *in divine Service — or when it is otherwiſe in the* Church *pronounced: Yet*, ſaith he, *by the manner of ſhewing this reverence*, viz. *with lowlineſs of courteſy, and uncovering the heads of mankind, it ſuppoſeth them at that time not to be imp'oyed in any other act of devotion. Anſwer*, By this way of commenting he may eaſily make the *Church* ſay whatever he pleaſeth; for this is to contradict

tradict the Text by his Commentary. Let him tell us when is that Name pronounced in the *Church*, and yet People at no other act of Devotion: This manner of reverence required, proveth nothing; for it is no wonder to hear them speak inconsistencies in requiring low courtesy, and uncovering of the head in time of Devotion, when the head is already uncovered; who injoin the same in the *Church* out of that Devotion, when that VVord is mentioned, tho' heads be already uncovered, as all must be in time of *Divine Service*; by *Can.* 18. the same that injoineth this *Bowing*. He saith, *it giveth no interruption to Devotion*: But doth it give none to other parts of Worship, which he is not pleased to call Devotion? He will still have it *lawful, as long as the object of Worship is true; the mention of this Name only expresseth the time as the Bell doth of going to* Church. *Answer*, It will then follow, that if *Papists* will only Worship God, not the Image; and use it only as a stated motive of Worship, that were lawful too. But he considereth not that the manner and mean of Worship may be sinful; when the object to which it is directed is true; and that this is so, is clear from what hath been said. I have also shewed how irrational it is to parallel the Bell to call People together with a sign stated in Worship to stirr up, or put in mind of it; what Mr. *A.* objecteth, that there is more need of this reverence in our ordinary converse, I have touched before: The *Dr.* maketh it a strange crosness, to deny it in Worship, and then plead for it in other cases. But Mr. *A.* doth not plead for it in any case, but useth this as a good reason to shew the folly of their imposition: But enough of this.

Sect. 35. The rest of his debate with Mr. *A.* may soon be dispatched. Mr. *A.* commendeth the moderation of the *Canon* 640. not imposing Worship toward the *East* or *Altar*; but leaving it indifferent, and pleadeth for the same Indulgence in other rites, as little necessary in themselves; as *Crossing*, *Kneeling*, *&c.* according to the Apostles rule, that differing parties should not judge nor censure one another, *Rom.* 14. 3. The *Dr.* in his answer, bringeth two reasons of this different practice; one is, the one sort of things were settled at the Reformation, not so the other; another is, the one is settled by Law, the other not. It is strange the *Dr.* should lay weight on either or both of these reasons in opposition to the Apostles command of forbearance; for the question still recurreth on the first setler of these, either by Law or otherwise: Why did they impose things so severely that the Apostle would have us bear with

with one another in? And then it recoileth on the upholders of this unwarantable ſettlement: Why do they continue ſuch impoſitions as may be for-born, and divide the *Church* by ſo doing? We do prove theſe things unlawful as the *Dr.* requireth; but tho' we ſhould fail in that proof, their counting them indifferent is enough to condemn ſuch ſevere impoſing of them. He ſaith, *page* 364. that Mr. *A.* thinketh the rule of forbearance *Rom.* 14. to be of equal force in all ages, and as to all things about which Chriſtians have different apprehenſions; and then *Papiſts* may come in for a ſhare as to worſhipping the *Hoſt*, *Images*, *&c.* Had Mr. *A.* talked at this rate, the *Dr.* would (as he doth on leſs ground) have ſaid *his fancy had been diſordered, and all things were not right ſomewhere.* Did ever Mr. *A.* or any of us ſay this, or words to that effect? We ſay this of things indifferent, not of things about which Chriſtians differ; and ſo I hope the *Papiſts* are ſufficiently ſhut out.

Sect. 36. VVhen Mr. *A.* or any of us, blame the leading *Churchmen* for uſing theſe things that are not impoſed, we make this no grounds of *Separation*, as the *Dr.* would inſinuate. VVhat Mr. *A.* ſaith of diſagreeing in a circuſtantial part of VVorſhip, is not the concluſion of his diſcourſe, to prove a diſagreement in *ſubſtantial* parts of Worſhip; but an *Antitheſis* (ſufficiently proved) to the *Dr*'s. aſſertion, that all our difference was about *circumſtances* of VVorſhip; and he makes it appear, that not only they with the *Diſſenters*, but they among themſelves did ſo diſagree; while ſome of them *Bow* to the *Altar*, others not. If this be not a part of VVorſhip, I ſee not how *Bowing* to an *Image* can be called ſuch. He further blameth Mr. *A. page* 365. at the end, for making a ſort of middle things (able to juſtify *Separation*) between *Subſtantial* parts of VVorſhip, and meer *Circumſtantials*. And the *Dr.* doth moſt unjuſtly inferr from thence, that *Separation* is juſtified by things that are neither *Subſtantial* nor *Circumſtantial* parts of VVorſhip, and no part of it at all. For he will not conſider, that tho' Mr. *A.* doth not make the *Ceremonies* meer *Circumſtantials*, yet he maketh them *Circumſtantial* parts of VVorſhip; that is, parts of VVorſhip without, which all that VVorſhip that Chriſt hath inſtituted is confeſſed to be intire. And if Mr. *A.* do alſo go about to prove that the *Ceremonies* are made by the *Churchmen Subſtantial* parts of VVorſhip, it is no incoherency in him, but in them who talk ſo variouſly of theſe rites; ſometimes as the verieſt triſles that can be, ſometimes as ſo much conducing to the Glory and Decency of Goſpel-VVorſhip. The truth is, *Subſtantial* parts of Worſhip,

VVorſhip, is a term of the *Drs.* (as Mr. *A.* telleth him) none of ours; and therefore if we do not apply it ſometimes to his mind, let him blame himſelf for not making it more intelligible to us by his explication of it.

SECT. IX.

The other Pleas *pretended for* Separation.

VVE come now with the *Dr.* to the next Plea uſed for *Separation*; to wit, that the *Diſſenters* are ſtill unſatisfied in their Conſciences about the *Churches terms of Communion*, and the *Church* excommunicateth them; and therefore they cannot join. He is pleaſed to join theſe two, tho' very diſtinct, yet he proſecuteth them ſeverally. For the latter, which he ſpeaketh firſt of, the *Diſſenters* Plea, that he is pleaſed to take off is, the *Excommunication ipſo facto* by the *Canon* 6. that we all lye under. Before I conſider his anſwer to this, I muſt tell him of two things that have more weight to juſtify our *Separation* than that *Canonical Excommunication*. 1. That many thouſands of us are otherwiſe *Excommunicated* for our non-compliance with the *Ceremonies*; even by the perſonal application, and publiſhing of the ſentence againſt us; yea, multitudes may not go to *Church* if they would, being under the Writ *de capiendo Excommunicato*, and daily watched for to be apprehended; this putteth on us a forcible neceſſity of *Non-communion*, and conſcience of Worſhipping God, and waiting on the means of Grace, engageth us to meet privately to enjoy theſe ordinances that we cannot have publickly. The ſecond thing is, even they who are not under the ſentence of *Excommunication*, yet are materially *Excommunicated* by your *Church* if they will not comply with your *Ceremonies*; for we can have none of the Sacraments without them; and your *Canon* excludeth us out of the *Church* unleſs we *Bow* at the Name of *Jeſus*. So that we cannot, if we never ſo fain would, enjoy God's Ordinances among you, without partaking your *Ceremonies*. Wherefore all the blame that can be caſt on us, is not uſing the *Ceremonies*. From which we have ſufficiently cleared our ſelves in the eyes of unby-aſſed Men; all that followeth on this is not to be charged on us, but on the rigour of your *Church*, which forceth us from among them.

Sect. 2. The *Dr.* anſwereth to the Plea from the *Canonical Excommunion*, *Sect.* 33. *page* 367. that, that *Excommunication* is not againſt ſuch

ſuch as modeſtly ſcruple the lawfulneſs of the things impoſed, but againſt thoſe who obſtinately affirm it; and he blameth Mr. *B.* as miſciting the words of the *Canon*. Wherefore I ſhall ſet down the whole *Canon*, it is the *Can.* 6. of the Convocation, 1603. *Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm, that the Rites and Ceremonies of the* Church *of* England, *by Law Eſtabliſhed, are wicked, anti-chriſtian, or ſuperſtitious; or ſuch as being commanded by lawful Authority, men who are zealouſly, and godly affected, may not with any good conſcience approve them, uſe them, or as occaſion requireth ſubſcribe to them, let him be Excommunicated* ipſo Facto, *and not reſtored untill he repent, and publickly revoke theſe his wicked Errours.* The *Dr.* hath a ſubtile diſtinction here between, *but affirm*, which term Mr. *B.* had uſed, *and affirm:* One would think that *affirm*, and no more added to it, ſignifieth no more than *but affirm:* But the *Dr.* ſaith, that *affirm, ſignifieth theſe circumſtances, which according to the common ſenſe of mankind, do deſerve Excommunication*, viz. *that it be done publickly and obſtinately.* What ground the *Dr.* hath for this criticiſm, I know not; I am ſure his citation out of *Auguſtine*, that a man is born with till he find an accuſer, or obſtinately defend his opinion, ſaith nothing of the ſenſe of the word *affirm.* Neither do I think that our Courts will be ruled by *Auguſtine* or the *Dr.* either. If a man with the greateſt modeſty imaginable, being asked, why he doth not Conform; ſhall ſay, he cannot do it with a good conſcience, he falleth under the plain letter of this Law, and goeth againſt the expreſs words of it; and this is the leaſt that a modeſt man can ſay, unleſs he will ſay, I will not do it, and that will be called obſtinacy; and ſo bring him under the Law, in the *Dr*'s. own ſenſe. But if the man (as a modeſt man may) give reaſons for his *Non-conformity*, when men require him to Conform, every word he ſaith, will bring him under this Excommunication.

Sect. 3. Another anſwer that the *Dr.* bringeth againſt this Plea, is *pag.* 368, 369. where he tells us of *the opinion of Canoniſts, that ſuch an excommunication is but a commination, and cannot affect the perſon till a ſentence be paſt, applying it to him; and that men under ſuch excommunication are not obliged to execute it againſt themſelves, by withdrawing from the Church.* I ſhall not contend about this, though one would think that ſuch excommunication as he deſcribeth, were rather *ipſo Jure*, than *ipſo Facto*; and that excommunication *ipſo Facto*, bringeth one under the ſentence as ſoon as the fact is committed. But to let that paſs, this excommunication declareth what we are to expect; and the frequent, yea, general execution of it, putteth moſt part out of capacity to come to *Church*, and may juſtly alarm the reſt to ſeek

a retreat for themſelves in time. It is as when an act of baniſhment is paſſed by the Magiſtrate, the party is ſo far looſed from his Obligation to that Society, that he may with a good conſcience withdraw before he be violently tranſported; ſure ſuch excommunication, and the fact, (which we neither deny, nor are aſhamed of) are enough to looſe our tie that we had to the *Church*.

Sect. 4. He anſwereth a queſtion; *Can theſe be called Schiſmaticks who are firſt excommunicated by the Church?* He ſaith, *they may in two caſes.* 1. *When there is juſt cauſe for the ſentence.* *Reply*, I deny not but ſuch are to be condemned for their giving juſt cauſe for ſuch a ſentence, and it may be on the ſame ground they may be called *Schiſmaticks*; but to call men *Schiſmaticks* for not joining with a Society that hath caſt them out, ſeemeth to be ſuch a figure, as when men are called *Fugitives*, who are juſtly baniſhed; but I will not contend about words: If the *Dr.* can prove our excommunication juſt, let him call us what he will. The inſtances he giveth, make nothing for that; none of theſe *Churches* require ſinful *terms of Communion*, impoſing mens deviſes in the Worſhip of God, and then excommunicate men for not ſubmitting to them. His ſecond caſe, in which excommunicates are *Schiſmaticks*, is, if they ſet up *New Churches*, which he proveth from the inſtances of the *Churches* that he had before mentioned. *Reply*, He now ſuppoſeth the excommunication to be unjuſt, elſe this caſe were coincident with the former: And in that caſe I diſtinguiſh his aſſertion. The unjuſt excommunication is either for an alledged perſonal fault, or for a principle of Religion unjuſtly called falſe. Again, it is either paſt againſt one or few, or it is againſt a great multitude, a conſiderable part of a *Church* or *Nation*. If it be for an alledged perſonal fault (where it is hardly ſuppoſed that a great part of the *Church* can be concerned) I do not ſay that ſuch may ſet up new *Churches*. It is fit ſuch ſhould quietly wait till they can be cleared; they having in that caſe no ground to charge the *Church* with any fault in Doctrine, Worſhip, or Diſcipline; but in the miſ-application of a true and right way of Diſcipline. But where the unjuſt excommunication is for a ſound principle, falſly called errour; and it alſo reacheth a great part of the *Church*, Miniſters and People: I ſee no reaſon why they ſhould not have the Worſhip of God among themſelves, let men call it ſetting up of new *Churches*, or what they will. For, 1. It were ſtrange if the half of a *Church* or *Nation*, or near ſo many, ſhould be obliged to live without the Ordinances of God, for the Caprice of ſome ambitious *Churchmen*, who excommunicate them, becauſe they will not dance after their

their Pipe. 2. In this caſe, the Orthodox had been *Schiſmaticks*, when they were excommunicated by the *Arians*, and ſet up New *Churches*. 3. Chriſt ſhould oblige his People to live without his Ordinances, becauſe of their love to the purity of them. What the Author objecteth out of *Auguſtine* is not to be underſtood of our caſes, but for private men excommunicated for falſly-imputed crimes; not for any thing of their Faith, for he bids them keep the true Faith, without *Separate* meetings.

Sect. 5. Our Author proceedeth, in the end of page 371. and forward, to conſider another Plea, made for *ſeparation*; *to wit*, ſcruple of Conſcience, which, I think, none do make the ſole ground of *ſeparation*; but they have a ground for their ſcruple: If that ground be good, it will warrant the ſcruple, and the *ſeparation* too; if not, it can do neither. And therefore I ſhall not inſiſt on this as a plea, diſtinct from what I have already defended. I ſuppoſe the Author that mention it intend no more than I ſay; only they may rationally maintain, that a ſcruple not ſufficiently warranted, in a perſon otherwiſe ſober and ſound, about a matter indifferent, or not intollerably evil, tho' it doth not free the ſcrupler from all blame, yet may oblige the *Church* not to impoſe with rigour the things ſo ſcrupled on ſuch a perſon. The *Dr.* here doth not act the part of a Diſputant, nor a Caſuiſt; but of ſomewhat elſe that I ſhall not name. For when it had been pleaded, that theſe ſcruples are great, of long ſtanding, not to be removed without very over-powering impreſſions on mens minds: He anſwereth, by a harange full of contempt of his adverſaries, that *a little impartiality and conſideration would do it, but that we read, judge, and hear only on one ſide; think it a temptation to examin, cry out, we are ſatisfied already, are not willing to be informed, nor glad of light; fly out into rage at them who endeavour to remove our ſcruples, &c.* If we be ſuch men, why hath the Learned *Dr.* written ſo long a Book to refute us; it is no wonder that he ſtirr up the Magiſtrate againſt ſuch, and the People too; to cry out, *away with ſuch fellows from the Earth, it is not fit they ſhould live.* He asketh, *where lyeth the ſtrength and evidence of our ſcruples?* If I ſhould ſpeak in his dialect, I ſhould anſwer in the arguments by us produced, which he and all his party are not able to anſwer, nor have ever anſwered; but I had rather diſpute than ſcold: He ſaith, *we may ſee light if we will:* We ſay, *we would ſee it if we could, and think we could ſee it, if it were to be ſeen.* He telleth us how eaſy this diſpute is. We aſſent, and wonder that ſo Learned a Man ſhould go about to darken ſo plain a truth. He chargeth us with willful miſtake; a miſtake we deny, and make

the contrary of it appear; but if it be a miſtake, that it is willful, we alſo deny; and though we cannot in this, ſatisfy them who are reſolved to *caſt Iniquity upon us*, &c. yet we can make our appeal the to Searcher of hearts, who will one day judge us, and our raſh judgers.

Sect. 6. He conteſteth, *page* 373. with Mr. *A.* about ſome expreſſions of his that he alledgeth Mr. *A.* miſtook; there is no need of inſiſting on ſuch debates: Brethren ſhould ſtudy to underſtand one another, and conſtrue every thing to the beſt. But if the *Dr.* had been as careful to vindicate his own cauſe as his own words, he would have refuted Mr. *A*'s pertinent and weighty diſcourſe, *pag.* 72, 73, 74. which he hath but lightly, or hardly at all touched. He proceedeth, *pag.* 376. to deal with another of his Antagoniſts, who objecteth, that theſe who cannot conquer their ſcruples, as to Communion with our *Church*, muſt either return to the ſtate of Paganiſm, or ſet up new *Churches*, by joyning with the ejected Miniſters. The *Dr*'s. Anſwer is, *that this is new Doctrine*; *the old* Puritans *ſuppoſed men obliged to continue in the Communion of our* Church, *altho' there were ſomethings that they ſcrupled at*. *Reply*, I have formerly ſhewed that there were old *Puritans*, that did both ſcruple and act as we do; but I deny not that ſome did join with the *Church*, but then their ſcruples and ours do differ: They thought the *Ceremonies* were inconvenient, yet might be uſed; we think them unlawful, and not to be uſed: There was alſo another difference, they met with ſome indulgence, and were ſuffered to Worſhip God with the *Church*, and forbear the things that they ſcrupled; We meet with nothing but rigour and ſevere impoſing of theſe, and therefore, whatever they did, we are under this unpleaſing choice, either to ſin againſt God and our Conſciences, or to ſet up *Separate Meetings*, or to return to the ſtate of *Paganiſm*; *i. e.* to live without the Ordinances of God.

Sect. 7. It is objected, that we ſcruple joining in the Sacraments, and living under ſome of the Miniſters. He anſwereth, that *he never heard this laſt alledged for a ground of Separation*; neither do I inſiſt on it, as I have before declared; ſave, where they Preach falſe Doctrine, or otherwiſe corrupt the Ordinances, ſo as we cannot join in them without our perſonal ſin: And this ſcruple hath been often heard of. *It is too vulgar a way of reaſoning, it is a hard caſe if People muſt fly into ſeparation, becauſe all their Miniſters are not ſuch as they ought to be.* Pray, who ever ſaid ſo? *But the* Dr. *would fain know whether, as often as men do ſcruple joining with others, their ſeparation be lawful,*

ful. This is eaſily known by a leſs knowing perſon than the Learned Dr. *St.* for all men knows and acknowledge, that ſcrupling can never make *Separation* lawful; it is good ground for theſe ſcruples that muſt do that. Wherefore all the inſtances that he heapeth up of unjuſtifiable *Separations*, might have been ſpared, as wholly impertinent; O how eaſy is it to prove Learnedly that which no man denieth. After one of his Hiſtorical inſtances of a *Separation* from the *Churches* of *New-England*, he asketh, *what is there in this caſe but is every whit as juſtifiable, as the preſent* Separation? *Anſ.* There is in it, that theſe *Separatiſts* could not with any reaſon object to the *Church* from which they *Separated*, that ſhe impoſed on them any Religious *Ceremonies* of mens deviſing, or other unlawful *terms of Communion*, and then excommunicated them for not ſubmitting to theſe. He telleth us, *page* 378. that no ſetled *Church* doth allow this liberty of *Separation*, becauſe men cannot conquer their ſcruples. It is true, neither is it fit they ſhould allow it meerly on that account; but withal he might have added, that few ſetled *Churches* except that of *Rome*, and that of *England*, do tempt, or rather force men to ſcruple, and to *Separate* by impoſing unneceſſary *terms of Communion*, which they know many count unlawful. What he ſaith *ibid.* for *Papiſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, and *Quakers* pleading for the ſame liberty of *Separating*, doth no way come up to our caſe. Neither are their ſcruples built on good grounds, nor are the things that they ſcruple, known by the *Church* that impoſeth them to be unneceſſary things. He wondereth that none hath taken care to put a ſtop to *Separation*, by ſhewing what ſcruples are to be allowed, and what not. Hath this never been done by *Non-conformiſts?* Have we not alſo taught that the *Church* ought to bear with them who ſoberly diſſent in the leſſer concerns of Religion; and not impoſe unneceſſary things on Peoples Conſciences: If theſe were attended to, a ſtop might ſoon be put to *Separation*; but if *Men* will ſcruple without cauſe on the one hand, and the *Church* will impoſe without cauſe on the other, there is no putting a ſtop to *Separations*, till the Lord cure our Diſtempers. Rigour and Perſecution, if it ſucceed to root out the Diſſenting Party, is one way to put a ſtop to *Separation*, but it is none of Gods way; and as it never had his approbation, ſo it ſeldom hath had ſucceſs.

Sect. 8. The Learned Author, *Sect.* 36. falleth on a new Subject; to wit, the uſe of *God-fathers* and *God-mothers* in Baptiſm. I never look't on this as a ſufficient ground of *Separation*, and therefore might wave this whole debate: But I think it is an abuſe, and therefore

ſhall

ſhall ſay a little on this Subject. Here we have not any inſtitution to guide us, there being nothing in Scripture, that I know of, about *Sponſion* for the party Baptized: And therefore, as on the one hand, what the nature of the thing and reaſon make neceſſary, ſhould not be withſtood; ſo on the other, what is beyond that, ſhould not be practiſed, and far leſs impoſed. All the queſtion is about the uſe of Sponſers in the Baptiſm of Infants, for the adult are to undertake for themſelves. Some make the uſe of *God-fathers*, to be witneſſes of the Childs-Baptiſm. That is very needleſs, for the whole *Church* are witneſſes of that. The true uſe of them is to repreſent the Child as a party covenanting with God, in this Solemn Sealing of the Covenant of Grace between God and the Infant; and conſequential to this, to undertake the inſtruction and education of the Child in the Chriſtian Religion; and endeavouring to engage him to a perſonal owning of the Covenant. The original of other *Sponſors* beſide the Parents was, in the Primitive *Church*, many young ones, either born of *Heathen*-Parents, or Orphans of *Chriſtian*-Parents, falling into the Tuition of *Heathen*-Relations, in reference to their worldly concerns, were in hazard by that means to be bred in Heatheniſm: Wherefore it was judged needful that ſome faithful, and intelligent Chriſtian ſhould undertake for their Religious Education. This uſage which reaſon had firſt brought in, oſtentation did afterward enlarge, by multiplying *God-fathers* and *God-mothers*; and after that, Superſtition did pervert it, by excluding the Parents, and putting ſtrangers in their room; till at laſt in Popery, it was quite depraved, by making a ſpiritual kindred to reſult from this action. Wherefore, we do not deny the uſe of *Sponſors*, but think the Parents the moſt proper *Sponſors*; both on account of their opportunity, obligation and natural inclination, to do the office of a *Sponſor* for the Child, which may rationally be thought to be more in them than in a ſtranger; and we think it a groſs abuſe to admit of other *Sponſors*, except in the want of Parents, or their Inhability. I think alſo, conſidering things as they are, not barely in the notions that men have of things that they will defend; this practice is fallen into ſuch abuſe, that even that ſhould make it be laid aſide; for it is manifeſt and moſt common, that God-fathers and God-mothers are choſen moſt unqualified for, and moſt unconcerned in that which they make a ſolemn promiſe to God to perform, which is a horrid mocking of Him and his Ordinances: Are not Boys and Girls choſen, or Debauched and Ignorant Perſons; or

Stran-

Strangers, that may be, ſhall never ſee the Child again, nor mind it, except it be to ſend it a new Coat?

Sect. 9. The *Dr.* telleth us of Mr. *Cartwright*; yea, and all Proteſtant Churches approving of this. But will he ſay, that they are for Excluding the Parents? which is the very thing that we controvert; For as the *Dr.* confeſſeth, *Can.* 29. Ordaineth, *That Parents need not be Preſent, and that they ſhall not be admitted to Anſwer:* that is, they muſt not undertake for the inſtruction and education of their own Child. But ſaith he, *The Parents are to provide ſuch as are Fit.* I deſire to know what Warrant is for this, even from ſound reaſon? Who can be ſo Fit, by his opportunity and care, as the Parent? And if he be wholly unfit, as to underſtanding, and reſpect to true Religion, we are not againſt his having a Deputy, in that Caſe; that it is done with the Parents conſent, is better ſo than otherwiſe; but that the Parent can tranſfer his right to another, is without all reaſon, unleſs the Perſon to whom ſuch a Tranſlation is made, do really take the education of the Child; which though by a private compact between the Parent and Sponſor, might be done; yet, what ſhadow of reaſon can be for a *Canon* compelling every Parent to do it? *It is* (ſaith he) *but like an occaſion of abſence*; to wit, *of the Parent, in which caſe all allow of a Sponſor. Anſ.* It is no way like it, for the one hath neceſſity to warrant it; the other hath nothing but mens will, or ſuperſtitious conceit. Is it alike for the State to make a Law that neighbours ſhould feed and cloath the Orphans of poor Parents; and to make a Law that they ſhall feed and cloath the Children of their rich Neighbours, who are alive? The caſe is juſt ſo here. It is an injury to a man, to have his Child taken from him without a cauſe, and given to another to be educated; ſo it is to be obliged, yea, forced to tranſfer upon another all that right he hath to repreſent his own child, and to engage for his education. He ſaith, *it is not the Churches intention to ſuperſede the obligation of the Parent, but to ſuperinduce a further obligation upon other Perſons.* Had the Parent been permitted to undertake for the Child jointly with the Sponſors, there had been ſome colour for this aſſertion; but that being expreſly denied by the *Canon*, it is evident that the *Church* doth what ſhe can to make the Parent think that no obligation at all lyeth on him. I meddle not with his debate againſt Mr. *B.* about Mr. *B*'s Argument againſt *Sponſors*, from the Childs having right to Baptiſm, only from the Parents; many learned men differ from Mr. *B.* in that, and I ſhall not digreſs to diſpute it.

Sect. 10.

Sect. 10. The *Dr. pag.* 386. ſaith, *he findeth nothing particularly objected againſt Kneeling at the Communion, that deſerveth conſideration, which he hath not anſwered in another place*; to wit, *Conferences Firſt Part*, which Book I have not ſeen; wherefore I ſhall in a few words lay down our Ground of Scrupling that Practice, and ſo leave it. We do not ſcruple Kneeling at Prayer, which is joyned with receiving of that Sacrament; nor do we deny that all poſſible reverence ſhould be uſed in going about that Holy Ordinance; but we think the expreſſion of that Reverence ſhould be of Gods appointing in his Word, or grounded on Nature, or civil Cuſtom, and not inſtituted by mans Will. 1. Then we ſcruple it, becauſe it is an uncommanded Act of Worſhip; that it is Worſhip, I think will not be denyed; Kneeling in Prayer cannot be denyed to be an Act of external Worſhip, no more than this: That it is uncommanded, we muſt believe, till they ſhew us a Command for it. They alledge, that Kneeling, being unqueſtionable a fit geſture to expreſs Humility and Adoration; it cannot be unfit, but needful in this Caſe where both are required. To this I reply, Humility is not fitly expreſſed by Kneeling, though Adoration be, and therefore we think Kneeling in the Act of Receiving to be no fit geſture, becauſe Adoreing, however needful it be in the complex Action of Communicating; *to wit*, before and after Receiving the Elements; it is not the Souls work in that Act, Believing or Covenanting with God, is the proper Exerciſe of the Soul in that Act, which is a ſolemn ſealing of the Covenant, and this Covenanting is very unfitly expreſſed by Kneeling. He that is about ſolemn Prayer or Adoration (which might be well expreſſed by Kneeling) in the Act of receiving that Sacrament, doth little know, or conſider, the nature and uſe of it; whence I form our Argument thus; that Religious Geſture which is neither Commanded by God, nor neceſſarily Connected with the Souls exerciſe in Worſhip by nature, and dictated by it; nor is by civil cuſtom made a fit expreſſion of the inward exerciſe of the Soul in that Worſhip; but is only impoſed by the Will of man, is unlawful to be uſed in that Worſhip; but Kneeling in the Act of receiving the Sacrament is ſuch; *Ergo*, *&c.* The major is clear, for that muſt in that caſe be Will-worſhip; the minor is proved by what is ſaid, and the concluſion followeth, *in ſyllogiſtica.*

Sect. 11. Another ground of our ſcruple is; this Practice is unprecedented in the Apoſtolick and pureſt Primitive *Church*; Chriſt with

with his Disciples Sate or leaned; they used the table gesture, then made decent by civil custom, and yet they used as much humility in receiving, and knew as well what was fit and decent aswe now do, or can. In after Ages this Practice was not used, it is well known that in *Tertullians* time, and till the beginning of the Fifth Century, they did not use to Kneel on any Lords Day between *Easter* and *Pentecost*, so much as at Prayer; and the *Canon* of the Famous First *Council of Nice* did forbid it; how then did they make the Communion Kneeling? A third ground is; this Kneeling is a Religious Adoration before a Creature, with a Religious respect to the Creature; but this is unlawful, *&c.* The first proposition is clear, for it is with respect to the Consecrated Elements before them, that we Kneel; and it will not be denyed that we there adore God Religiously. The second proposition I prove, because Protestants do generaly condemn Praying before an Image (as on other accounts, so on this) because it is an adoring of God before a Creature, with a Religious respect to it; let our Brethren shew us what the more moderate of the Papists give to their Images, that we do not give to the Consecrated Elements. We use the one as a a stated motive of Worship, as they do the other; they deny that they give any Worship to the Image, as we do with reference to the Elements. A fourth Ground is; this Practice, (as acknowledged by its Patrons to be Indifferent,) hath been grosly abused to Idolatry, the *Papists* in the same external way worshiping the Hoste. And it is known that this Practice came in with the belief of Christs Bodily presence in the Sacrament, and the *Papists* profess, that if they did not believe that, they would not so Kneel; and is it fit that we should so symbolize with them? which by this Practice we do to that degree, that it is not easy to distinguish our Adoration from theirs, by the spectators of both. These grounds I have but hinted, being spoken to more largely by others.

Sect. 12. He debateth next with Mr. *A. pag.* 386. for saying that on the same reason that the *Church* imposeth these *Ceremonies*, she may impose some use of Images, *&c.* to which the *Dr.* bringeth three Answers filling four Pages. All this discourse might have been waved, for neither Mr. *A.* nor any of us, did ever make that a ground of *Separation*; tho' we plead against the *Ceremonies* on that ground. If they will remove the present *Ceremonies*, we shall not for the asserting an Imposing power leave them; nor out of fear of what may come.

Sect. 13. The last plea for *Separation* that the *Dr.* first deviseth, and then refuteth is, *Sect.* 38. *That there is a parity of reason for our separating from the Church of* England, *and from the Protestants separating from the Church of* Rome; and this Plea he imputeth to Mr. *A.* in his Pre-

face (he ſhould have ſaid, Epiſtle Dedicatory) to *Miſchief of Impoſitions*; but I do not find that Mr. *A.* or any other, ever uſed ſuch a plea. All that he ſaith there is, *ad hominem*, againſt the *Dr*'s. ordinary crying out on us for *Separating* from a true *Church*; whereas the *Dr.* himſelf had owned *Rome* to be a true *Church*; *Ration: account. p.* 293. And *def. againſt* T. G. *p.* 785. and yet alloweth *Separation* from that *Church*: Wherefore I ſhall no further conſider any thing that he ſaith on that head. And I conclude with the *Dr.* and declare as he doth to the contrary, that I have examined all that he hath ſaid on the preſent Subject, and do find ſtill remaining ſufficient Plea to juſtify the preſent practice of *Non-conformiſts* in not joyning with the *Church* of *England*, but Worſhiping God in Meetings apart from it.

Sect. 14. The Learned *Dr.* is pleaſed to append to his Book, to ſet it off μέλα πόλλης φαρλαος, three Letters of three *French Divines*, Printed firſt in *French*, and then in *Engliſh*, *ad pompam*; for it is little *ad pugnam*. But he might know, what ever difference we give to learned and good men, their authority, without Scripture proof (which we yet deſiderate) will not prevail with us to alter our opinion or practice; let the *Dr.* call it obſtinacy, or by what name he pleaſeth. The firſt of them is from *Monſieur le Moyne* profeſſor of Divinity in *Leyden*, to the *Bp.* of *London*; the authority of which Letter (not of the learned Author of it) we have good cauſe to neglect; becauſe it is apparent to any that read it, that it is written by a ſtranger to us, upon groſs miſ-information of our principles: For he ſaith, *page* 404. that he could not have perſwaded himſelf that there had been any who believed that a man could not be ſaved in the Communion of the *Church* of *England*: And I join with him ſo far; that I know not, nor hear of one *Non-conformiſt* of that opinion; but thus it ſeems we are, by our Brethren, repreſented abroad; and then precarious Letters got by ſuch means muſt be produced as witneſſes againſt us. He alſo repreſenteth us as if we condemned all to hell that uſe the *Ceremonies*, *page* 405. and the ſame he ſaith about the *Church-Diſcipline*, *ibid.* and that we imagine that we are the only men in *England*, yea in the Chriſtian World, that are predeſtinated to eternal happineſs, and that hold truths neceſſary to Salvation, as they ought to be held, ſo he *page* 408. he alſo, *page* 409. tells us of a *Non-conformiſt*-Meeting he was at in *London*, where he expoſeth the Meeting and Preacher, as very ridiculous; and his calling the Preacher one of the moſt famous *Non-conformiſts*, ſheweth him to be either a very great ſtranger to them, or ſomewhat that is worſe. Let any now judge, whether ſuch a Teſtimony be to be received againſt us.

Sect. 15. The ſecond Letter from *Monſieur de l'Angle*, ſpeaks the Reverend

Reverend and Learned Author of it, to be an ingenious and ſober Perſon, but in ſome things miſinformed by the *Epiſcopal* Party: He lamenteth our Diviſions, ſo do we; he is for complyance with the *Ceremonies*, being ſetled, but is far enough from approving of them. The former part of this, I impute to his being leſs concern'd to conſider theſe things, than we are. He ſtateth our *Separation* mainly upon *Epiſcopacy*, which we do not; and he, no doubt, doth it upon Miſinformation: But it is obſervable, that this good man, whom the *Dr.* bringeth as a Witneſs on his ſide, doth as much blame the *Church* as us, whilſt he is for their quitting of *Ceremonies*, that occaſion *Separation*; which he inſiſteth much on, as the way to peace. A notable piece of Miſinformation that this worthy Perſon hath met with, is, That at a Conference held for Union with the *Diſſenters*, a little after His Majeſties Reſtauration, nothing letted the Agreement but ſome of the *Presbyterians*; the contrary of which, and their great Condeſcendency for Peace, is known to all *England*, and a laſting Monument of it to Poſterity, is the Book called, *A Petition for Peace*, containing the things that the *Presbyterians* propoſed, while the *Prelatical* Party would not part with, yea, nor forbear their Brethren in the leaſt *Ceremony*, or mode of their *Service*.

Sect. 16. The Third Letter is from the Famous and Excellent, *Monſieur Claude*, who walketh by the ſame Spirit, and in the ſame ſteps with his Reverend Colleague, *Monſieur de l'Angle*: He ſpeaketh of *Epiſcopacy* as tollerable; that one may, with a good Conſcience, live under it: This is not our Queſtion; but it ſeems the Queſtion hath been ſo ſtated to him, by them who had a mind to procure his Teſtimony to their Cauſe. He telleth us, they admit of Miniſters that had been Ordained by *Biſhops*; ſo do we: He doth highly commend Love and Concord: And we think it cannot be overvalued, where it can be had without Sin. He ſpeaketh of Advantages, both by *Epiſcopacy*, and Parity; and of diſadvantages by both, when managed by bad men. Nothing of which do we contradict. He complains of Extreams on both ſides, we do the ſame: We never yet thought all of our Party ſo moderate, as they ſhould be: After a proof of *Independency*, he comes to ſpeak of *Presbyterians*, with that decent reſpect that becometh a man of his underſtanding and breeding, and in a far other dialect than Dr. *St.* doth. He wiſheth them to be moderate in reference to the ſcandal that they think they have received from the *Epiſcopal Order*, and to diſtinguiſh the perſons from the Miniſtry; this we refuſe not. He doth indeed condemn our holding aſſemblies apart, but ſtateth it on this ground, *page* 445. as if we did *Separate* becauſe the publick aſſembles are held under *Epiſcopal* Government; and that we think our preſence there were an approving of it, which is wide

from

from our case; but no doubt is according to his information, for which we thank our *Episcopal Brethren*, and commend their ingenuity. To the same purpose is what he hath *page* 446. as if we thought we cannot with a good Conscience be present in the Assemblies; but only when we do fully and generally approve all things in them; which is far from our thoughts: These Principles he doth most solidly refute. He saith, *page* 447. that he cannot believe that any of us (*Presbyterians*) look on their *Episcopal Discipline*, or *Ceremonies* as blots and capital errours that hinder a man from Salvation. And doth in this truly judge, for we have always disowned such sentiments, we judge them sinful evils, which we dare not own; but have much charity to some who own them. He next adviseth the *Bishops* to moderation, and when the dispute is about *Ceremonies*, that are a stumbling-block, and nothing in comparison of communion, they would make it be seen that they love the Spouse of Christ, better than themselves. O that this advice were followed, how soon might Peace return to our Land Now wherein hath Mr. *Claude*, or his Colleague touched our controversy. Alas! good Men, they are abused by mis-representations. Their Letters give just ground to think, that if they were made Umpires between the two parties, *Prelatical* and *Presbyterian*, and heard the true state of our debate, and true matters of fact: they would be of the same mind with us. And I am sure the *Church* way that they practice is the same that we are for. Wherefore the *Dr.* with no loss to his cause might have waved the producing of these Letters. What acts are used by the *Prelatical* party to get foreign Divines to be on their side, or at least to say nothing against them, may be gathered from a passage in the Life of the Famous and great antiquary, *Monsieur l'Arrogie*; who having writ a Book, wherein he sheweth the Conformity of the Discipline of the *Protestant* Church of *Rome* (which all know to be *Presbyterian*) with that of the Primitive *Church*; And another in defence of *Monsieur Dialle*, touching the Letters of *Ignatius*, and the *Apostolical Constitutions*, against Mr. *Pearson* and *Beverige*, and having designed a reply to their answer that they had made to him, at the request of some that favoured *Episcopacy*, he did not finish his answer. These are pitiful shifts to support a tottering cause, of the same kidney is their denying relief to the *French Protestants*, Ministers and others, who do not Conform to the *Church* of *England*; the *Ceremonies* being to them of more value than the great Gospel Duty of charity. At *Dublin* 1685. a *French Minister* who Preached to some of these Exiles, was suppressed because he did not use the *Ceremonies*, nor *English Liturgy*. Since I wrote this, I have met with another instance of *Episcopal* ingenuity, for exposing the *Presbyterians* among the foreign *Churches*. It is in a Letter of the Famous *Bochart*, dated *Nov.* 2*d.* 1680. in answer to a Letter from Dr. *Morley*, wherein the *Dr.* representeth the *Presbyterian* Principles in three positions; whereof the third is a gross calumny, and excellently disproved by *Bochart*, and the *Presbyterians* fully vindicated by him; the position is, *Reges posse vi & armis a subditis cogi in ordinem & si se præbeant immorigeros, de solio deturbare, in carcerem conjici, sisti in jus & carnificem denique capite plecti*; and the *Dr.* asserts that these Principles were proved by the murder of K. *C.* 1*st.* The Reader may abundantly satisfy himself of the impudence of this calumny from Mr. *Bocharts* Letter, as it is Printed after his *Phaleg*, and *Canaan*; from *page* 66. of that Letter *Ed. Francford*, 1681.

12 JY 62

FINIS.